DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 388 JC 870 149

AUTHOR Morgan, Don A.
TITLE Community College Trustees and Their National Association.
INSTITUTION Postsecondary Planning Associates, Minneapolis, MN.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 105p.; Document contains small type.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Administration; *Community Colleges; *Educational History; *Governing Boards; National Organizations; *Professional Associations; *Trustees; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Association of Community College Trustees

ABSTRACT

An overview is provided of the conditions and forces which underpinned the creation of the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT). Chapter 1 looks at major developments in the two-year college field related to the formation of the ACCT, including information on alternative organizations available to two-year college trustees, differences between four-year and two-year college boards, and the disparate backgrounds of community college trustees. Chapter 2 provides background information on the rise, purposes, and mission of the modern two-year college. After chapter 3 contrasts the current functions and roles of trustees with earlier perceptions of what boards should do, chapter 4 examines the personal characteristics of trustees and the organizational characteristics of boards, summarizes differences between elected and appointed members of boards, and reviews findings of a study of the perspectives, satisfactions, and frustrations of board members. Chapter 5 traces the interest of community college trustees in seeking affiliation with a national association, describing their early affiliation with and later separation from the National School Board Association and the foundation of the ACCT. Chapters 6 and 7 cover the history of the ACCT from its creation in 1972 through its first decade, highlighting the activities and services of the association and evidence of its maturation as an organization. Appendices include a bibliography and chronology of key events in the history of ACCT. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEES

and

Their National Association

by

Don A. Morgan
University of Minnesota

with an
INTRODUCTION
by
John W. Casey, Chancellor
Seattle Community College District

and a
PROLOGUE
by
William Meardy, Executive Director
Association of Community College Trustees

Copyright @1983 by Postsecondary Planning Associates. All rights reserved.
No part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission in
writing from the publisher.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEDICATION

First to William and Joyce Meardy. This as they were co-partners in a commitment to community college trustees which involved considerable professional and personal risk. Their faith in what they were attempting to do and their success in doing it made it possible to have something worthwhile to study and write about.

Second to John W. Casey, Seattle Community College District Chancellor. John gave strong support at a critical time and was simply convinced that what had been written about trustees and the ACCT was too valuable to let die. Without this encouragement when he gave it, getting this little book out might never have happened.

Third to David Gaiser, Walter Click and Alma Galbraith, trustees at Big Bend Community College, Washington State. Their wisdom and patience (each served as chair of that board) guided me through some turbulent times as president of that institution. My vast respect for trustees came from the rewarding association I had with these three outstanding human beings.

Lastly to two beautiful children, Dylan and Caitlyn, partly by way of apology for time spent away from them, but mostly just in deep appreciation of themselves.

PROLOGUE

When my wife, Joyce, and I left community college work in California to embark on a career serving community college trustees, little did we know we were about to have the adventure of a lifetime. This was in April of 1970. We could not then see that the trustee movement would lead first to Illinois and then on to Washington D.C. After the initial interview with the Executive Director of the National School Boards Association (NSBA) and after signing a lease for an apartment in Winnetka, Illinois, I turned to Joyce and said, "Well, if it doesn't work out in two years, we can always go back to California." That was thirteen years ago!

Before those first two years were up, community college trustees had separated themselves from the NSBA and were struggling to form the new Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT). Some personal notes made during that period indicate how immediate the pressures were:

> From April 15, 1972, until May 31, 1972, the NSBA had been gracious to the extent that the new ACCT Executive Director (myself) was allowed to maintain his old NSBA office, a secretary and auxillary assistance plus salary as NSBA's contribution to the new ACCT. However, our move to Washington D.C. was not scheduled until August 1, 1972, so a crisis of sorts occurred on June 1, 1972, when the NSBA grace period ended. Joyce and I simply moved our living room furniture to one-half of the room, set up a card table for the rented typewriter and rented a post office box. Joyce became ACCT's first secretary--unpaid but dedicated.
>
> On July 31, 1972, I rented the smallest U-Haul (completely enclosed) trailer I could get and set off alone for Washington D.C. All the ACCT owned was in that trailer with room left over. . . .
>
> After moving into 955 L'Enfant Plaza and after the telephone man left, I gazed across the street to the U.S. Office of Education building and thought to myself, "Well, our move East from California is no longer an experiment. We are now committed to an idea whose time has come--for better or worse."

We did not then realize that a special side benefit would better reward us for our efforts than any material gain we might expect. That benefit evolved from working with the people we were soon to meet--this nation's community college trustees. We believe these dedicated citizens represent

the cream of American society, both in the United States and in Canada. We are often reminded of the quote, "I am a part of all whom I have ever met." Joyce and I are better human beings and our lives have been enriched by these greatest of all friends called "trustees."

William Meardy
Executive Director
Association of Community College Trustees
Washington D.C.
January, 1983

PREFACE

There is a different and quite distinct pulse to the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) when comparisons are made with it and other associations representing purely academic interests. An example would be to compare the ACCT with the American Educational Research Association (AERA). Both have their origins in the National Education Association (NEA), and both have evolved a long way from that parent body for quite parallel reasons--they wanted control over their own affairs and to concentrate on their own special interests. But both moved away in quite different directions.

As regards the ACCT it can be easily seen, for example, that the words they use and the kinds of ideas and suggestions these words convey are not those of the usual academician. The ACCT uses words much stronger, less meticulously contrived and qualified, more emotional, more direct and much closer to the political realities and commercial interests of the world beyond academia. There is the unmistakeable feel of the market place, Chambers of Commerce and of Rotary Clubs. They (the trustees and their ACCT--and the ACCT is most emphatically their association in the minds of most members) convey the feeling of American enterprise--"can do." There is a sense of their responding to urgency with confidence. To give but one example, there was the robust and nearly audacious proposition, carried with all seriousness in the ACCT newsletter, that community colleges be pre-packaged and sold to developing countries!

The AERA, on the other hand, is also caught up in education concerns, issues, problems, processes and practices, but there is less urgency for action and more care for qualification and clarification. There is little to no concern with political realities and commercial interests of the "outside" world. The published results and proceedings of AERA are couched in a language virtually incomprehensible to most trustees and, hence, are of extremely limited to absolutely no value to them.

The point of this comparison is that community college trustees operate in an academic setting which they may not always understand or appreciate. Yet they must concern themselves with the academic affairs of the two-year but nonbaccalaureate granting institutions they serve--indeed, they are compelled by law in most states to have such a concern. It is not surprising, for example, that they have great difficulty with the concept

of tenure or "automatic" salary increases on the basis of years of service. No such things as these exist in the world they come from and know more about!

One result, not surprisingly, is that there are inherent elements of conflict in a situation where citizen educators govern academics. The amazing thing is so little conflict actually emerges. This may be so as these trustees come from a distinct community, most usually quite proximous to the college they serve. They cannot easily lose sight of why they are where they are--what it is their community needs, wants and will tolerate. At the same time, they prove to be eager students of what community colleges are all about, and it cannot be over emphasized that community colleges are not and, equally important, do not see themselves as "juniors" whose sole purpose is to serve "senior" institutions. Trustees serving these institutions which have evolved in the 20th century seem intrigued and excited by them, and they seem more than willing to accept the challenges and rigors of serving them as "citizen educators." This does not mean they understand educators or academics all the time, but they seem to have respect for them and the institutions both trustees and academics serve.

The book at hand tries to describe and account for the drive of these trustees to create their own association. It is essentially an introductory history--not enough time has passed to permit a deeper work. It can be a first conclusion, by way of preface, to note the community college association is a very vital one and developments of importance still occur frequently. At best this book will lay a base for, and add dimension to a later, deeper work.

To better understand those trustees who are the focus of this work, it was decided a brief look at community colleges would be important. Part I, with two chapters, does this. The rise, purposes and missions of these modern two year colleges is presented in a brief overview. The questions dealt with are, essentially: why do we have them, what do they do, and why do we have trustees charged to govern them?

Part II deals with the trustees directly. The concern is with the characteristics, roles and perspectives of these community college "citizen-educators." This leads to Part III which deals with the reasons for and the efforts of these particular kinds of trustees to band together in a national associational body.

An Appendix gives a rough chart of the more important events in the history of the ACCT. It also gives a chain of command--a listing of the various officers elected over the years. This section concludes with details from the 1982 ACCT Annual Convention held in October, 1982, at New Orleans.

The whole study and writing project got going as a result of a personal relationship with William Meardy--one that goes back to the days before the ACCT was formed. Once the ACCT was up and going, it was suggested to Bill that a look at where ACCT had come from and why might be in order. This suggestion was made in the Spring of 1977.

In the five years which have passed since, Bill has given every ounce of support that was possible. He involved others within ACCT as well as the energy of himself and his wife to review and critique the various drafts put together.

Of particular value was the material included in a few diaries of key "pioneer" trustees--those who first became interested in establishing a national association where community college trustees could meet and confer. Bill had apparently anticipated such a work as this one as he had asked these "pioneers" to create diaries of their early organizational efforts.

These diaries, the entire files of ACCT, minutes of all meetings, publications and newsletters, memoranda and circulars, etc., were made available to support this project.

The whole of these materials represent a time span beginning in 1965 and extending through 1982. It embraces the events since community college trustees first struggled to organize as the Council of Community College Boards (CCCB) within the National School Boards Association (NSBA)--which itself had separated in the not too distant past from the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) which in turn had separated from the National Education Association (NEA).

ACCT Endorsement: Bill's support and involvement of trustees had at least one immediate and much appreciated result. The ACCT Board of Directors formally endorsed this book on October 16, 1982. This Board also requested it be included in the ACCT list of approved publications.

This book will serve best if it adds to an understanding and appreciation of community college trustees. There is, fortunately, an increasing if yet still woefully limited literature about these people and the boards

they serve. One of the more encouraging developments is that trustees are starting to write about themselves. This should be encouraged, and maybe this book will do that.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

Acknowledgements, perforce, must begin with William Meardy. It was not always a smooth path between the two of us as this work emerged, but he never doubted that it ought to be done. The question was how and when. In the end it must be observed gratefully that he committed one of the most valuable commodity each of us has--personal time, and Bill committed a lot of it. He also was persuasive eventually in involving the time of a lot of others who reviewed and criticized what had been written. Equally important was Bill's openness--he is a very direct person. You may not agree with him at the moment, but you have no doubt of where he is.

Jeanne Goddard and Worth Keene, both very important "pioneer" trustees in the ACCT organization effort, must be singled out from among the many trustees who were eventually involved in this work. Jeanne and Worth provided enormously important and interesting diaries, and these have added substance as well as warmth to what has been produced.

Lastly, though only in a time sense, was the support and encouragement of John Casey, Chancellor of Seattle Community College District. John and I share many experiences going back to when we were both post-doctoral students under B. Lamar Johnson at U.C.L.A. Both of us share a commitment to the community college movement, and both of us feel more ought to be known about community college trustees. John and I have recently found additional mutual interests in the intercultural and international educational areas, and this gave us several opportunities to share hopes for this book simply as we kept running into each other in various parts of the world.

Casey's contribution of an INTRODUCTION adds greatly to the text. However, it was his offering of good offices for rewrites and criticism and in offering to print the work if necessary, that were critical to mustering the final energy necessary to produce what follows.

Final judgement will be in what this work means to trustees, each of them as well as their boards. More immediate will be if it makes a contribution first to the literature of the community college field and also to that about the trustees who serve those institutions.

Finally, there will be errors found by the critical reader--both errors of commission as well as omision. It is hoped these will be called to the attention of the author who must bear responsibility for them.

Don A. Morgan
Minneapolis, Minnesota
February, 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. A. Morgan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Prologue by William Meardy Executive Director of the Association for Community College Trustees	vii
Preface	ix
List of Tables	xvi
Introduction by John W. Casey Chancellor of the Seattle Community College District	xvii
PART I: THE FOUNDATION UNDERGIRDING BOARD ACTION	
Chapter One: The Setting	5
Chapter Two: The Platform	15
PART II: BOARDS AND TRUSTEES — WHY, WHO AND HOW	
Chapter Three: Function and Role	27
Chapter Four: Characteristics and Perspectives	37
PART III: GETTING IT TOGETHER	
Chapter Five: Search for a Home	51
Chapter Six: Independence and Transition: 1972-75	65
Chapter Seven: Growth and Maturity of ACCT: 1975-82	77
Bibliography	92
Appendix	93

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Occupations of Trustees	39
2.	Board Functions	41
3.	Sources of Greatest Pressure on Boards	42
4.	Sources of Future Problems and Pressures for Boards to Contend With	43
5.	Recommended Activities for New Presidents	44
6.	Level of Performance of Boards by Presidents	45
7.	Analysis of ACCT Newsletters	72
8.	Proposed Revisions 1980-81 Budget	83
9.	Association of Community College Trustees Membership Report as of January 31, 1981	84

INTRODUCTION

by

Chancellor John W. Casey
Seattle Community College District

There is an implied statement in this work of Don Morgan's, which follows, that we need to know more about those trustees who serve our community colleges. I agree with this wholeheartedly. It is also well that this message is couched in a general and easy to understand frame which explains how community colleges have evolved and what they are: i.e., just what is it that trustees are expected to govern.

There is a hope that this small work can serve two basic purposes: first, as a readable and ready reference for trustees--those people who serve on the governing boards of the community, technical and junior colleges and who may wish to know more about these institutions, as well as about themselves and the Association they have formed; second, as a reference for administrators, faculty, and staff at these same institutions which might help them in understanding the nature, needs, and notions of trustees--specifically that they are dedicated citizen-educators who expose themselves to long hours and considerable pressures for very few rewards.

It has long been the conviction of this writer, gained from many years of experience within the community college world as faculty member and administrator, that a mutual understanding is highly prized between trustees and the people within the college governed by the trustees. This can lead to a relationship of trust, and where this is achieved, there is direct benefit to the institutions involved. I hasten to note that it is not at all necessary that school personnel and trustees like each other or completely understand the different professional backgrounds and lifestyles represented. What is to be hoped is that all can come to respect each other within this trustful relationship. This offers a situation where such vibrant institutions as community colleges have a better chance of achieving the tremendously diverse and important goals that have been established for them. This conviction seems to be shared full score by Morgan, a former community college president.

It is important to note here, as is done in the later text, that the literature on trustees is widening. Some of this, fortunately, is being written by trustees. The Association which the trustees have brought into

being, The Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT), has also been most useful in this effort by producing both regular and special publications which focus on trustees and their concerns. However, this literature is not yet extensive, and additions to it should be encouraged. It is this last consideration which led Seattle Community College District to endorse and support the present publication.

That last observation, the inevitable question of just why Seattle Community College District should become involved in a publication of this kind, which is in essence a national study, is answered in a straightforward manner--Seattle has always had a group of trustees vitally interested in their own community but also with a deep and abiding concern for the national and international development of the community college movement. This concern may be a natural extension of the interests of a citizenry representing a city with a history as a lusty and bustling world-port city--drawing produce from the heart of the nation and sending it on to Alaska, the Orient and beyond as well as receiving products from all over the world as a distribution point to the rest of the United States.

There is also in Seattle an easy acceptance of the concept of a continually expanding frontier, and this may also partially explain the ready acceptance of the area for the vast aerodynamic and space industries found in this region. In short, as this work supports the nation's trustees of community colleges, why shouldn't Seattle become involved?

Indeed Seattle has been involved in the community college trustee affairs of the country almost constantly since emerging as an independent district in 1967. By 1970, P. Cameron DeVore, one of the first trustees for the new district, was asked by B. Lamar Johnson of U.C.L.A. to present a paper at one of the first major national conferences which focused entirely on community college trustee issues and concerns. This conference involved administrators, professors, trustees and representatives from two of the major groups seeking to represent trustees at a national level. DeVore's paper was later included in a publication of U.C.L.A., and it is quoted in the manuscript which follows this introduction (see pages 29-30).

Bill Meardy also gave a paper at the 1970 U.C.L.A. conference. He was then working for the community college trustee group attached to the National School Boards Assocation (NSBA). Meardy was also then advocating that community college trustees should strike out alone. It was this conviction of Meardy's, fortunately shared by many committed trustees, which

led them to form their own association, the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) outside of the confines of both the National School Boards Association (NSBA) and of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC). The history of this sequence of events is one of the main concerns of the following text.

Dr. Morgan also presented a paper in 1970 at the U.C.L.A conference on trustees. It was a report of a national survey of what trustees thought presidents and trustees did and ought to do. This paper, plus a later survey, led Meardy to request information from Morgan as the base for a story which appeared in an ACCT newsletter. This request also led to a long-term informal relationship between Morgan and Meardy which doubtless led to the latter sharing the entire ACCT files with Morgan so that the present volume could be written.

This writer has been involved also in ACCT affairs and with Meardy in several ways. The most recent is that of chairing the Advisory Committee of Presidents to the ACCT. The primary focus of this Advisory Committee of Presidents has been to establish a vehicle for ongoing communications between presidents and trustees at a national level; i.e., beyond the single institutional concern.

It must be quickly noted that there is an irreducible bottom line separating presidents from trustees--the professional career and reputation of the president is always on the line--at all times. Trustees are exposed in the political arena which naturally emerges from the governance concerns they are charged to consider, but it is rare that their livelihood is threatened--being a trustee is not usually an occupation! As the presidents or other chief administrators serve directly at the pleasure of these trustees, it is only natural they would have substantial interest in what it is their particular trustees are considering at both the local and the national associational level.

It is to the lasting credit of ACCT that the Presidents Advisory Committee was formed. It has come to serve as an advocate agency for the ACCT itself. For example, the Advisory Committee has taken on the project of determining which colleges or districts are <u>not</u> now members of the ACCT. It then will follow up to make sure that non-member colleges or districts become aware of the advantages and importance of holding membership in the ACCT.

It is hoped this present little book will be well received by the trustees as well as by community college personnel. If it is well received: i.e.,

sales of it can cover basic costs, there are most tentative plans to make the AACJC Presidents Academy the next target for study and publication. Morgan has already coauthored a history of one of the principal affiliated councils of the AACJC, the Council of Universities and Colleges (CUC)--a Council made up of the professors housed in graduate schools within universities and concerned with the study of and preparation of personnel to work in community colleges. A similar study of the Presidents Academy of the AACJC would have to trace the recent history of the AACJC with focus on the point of reorganization which led to the formation of the various affiliated councils as well as the formation of the Presidents Academy. This same reorganization effort of AACJC impacted on the development of the present national trustees association, ACCT.

Central to the purpose of the present publication is that many people--both faculty and trustees--come to these institutions knowing precious little about why these colleges exist or from whence they came. This should in no way be viewed as an unfair critical statement. It is proper that employees and board members have focused on the acquisition of specific skills and talents which will help these institutions achieve their purposes. For example, a welder is expected to have studied and practiced that particular profession in order to become a desirable employee of the college. The same is true for an English instructor, as well as for trustees who gain their talents and expertise also from study and work most usually outside of community colleges. None can be expected to have been overly concerned earlier with the origin and genesis of the community college movement. It is viewed as potentially of some great value if after they arrive on the scene they learn something about the vehicle they have climbed aboard. This holds particularly true for the trustees who have come to serve these modern institutions. This little book may help most in helping people to acclimate.

The bottom line is that a host of strangers to the community college movement are assembled within them and asked to help make them function efficiently. As with any institutional vehicle, there are frequent signs of malfunction and misdirection. It is exceedingly important that all involved understand the irreducible purpose of community colleges: they have been brought into being to extend educational opportunity beyond the secondary level! They exist to extend educational access to people who can profit from it and otherwise might be denied this opportunity. The text which follows has this clearly in focus, and it is with pleasure that I introduce it and recommend it to you.

Seattle, Washington
February, 1983

xx

COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEES

and

THEIR NATIONAL ASSOCIATION

PART ONE:

THE FOUNDATION UNDERGIRDING BOARD ACTION

Chapter One: The Setting
Chapter Two: The Platform

CHAPTER ONE

The Setting

Something such as the Association for Community College Trustees (ACCT) had to form. The pressures to do this simply would not be denied. A principal force seems to have been that the trustees wanted to start their own organization and not have a part in one started by others for other reasons. Also, trustees wanted one dominated by themselves and not by professional educators. There was also a need for national representation and a "presence" in the nation's capitol. It was an "idea whose time had come."

Trustees are drawn, for the most part, from occupations outside of educational institutions. Once operating as trustees, they must come quickly to understand, as well as guide, a different kind of postsecondary institution--the American comprehensive community college. The matter of orientation and education of trustees is a recurring one, and it is a process they want to direct--that is, trustees want to teach other trustees.

It should be noted early that though "community college" usually refers to those found in the United States, it could also include, in many instances, those found in Canada. Canadian community colleges have evolved more recently than those in the United States, but there is a clear relationship between the two. There are striking differences in organization and governance between Quebec and British Columbia,[1] but then that can be said of California and Minnesota.[2] Commonalities easily outweigh differences in either case. At any rate, it has seemed natural to U.S. college trustees to accept and involve their Canadian counterparts in the ACCT.

Alternatives to ACCT

There were existing national organizations available to community college trustees. They did not have to form their own. The three more important groups available were: (1) the Association of Governing Boards (AGB); (2) the National School Boards Association (NSBA); and (3) the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC).

The university-dominated Association of Governing Boards (AGB) seemed to be the least attractive from an institutional point of view. Some community college trustees had enjoyed rubbing elbows with their university counterparts and had joined AGB. However, their numbers were never large.

The problem may have been then, as now, that universities seem forever "discovering" community colleges and never quite understanding them. This

is true in spite of commonalities shared in particular by the large land grant universities and large numbers of community colleges--both seek to widen and extend educational opportunity. However, it also should be stressed that many community colleges evolved out of junior colleges, and that those early junior colleges did and were expected by universities to serve them essentially as screening agencies. Today's community colleges consider themselves "junior" to nothing and regard the universities as a decreasing, if not a secondary, concern. More attention is now paid to vocational programs and to individual student and local community needs.

The National School Boards Association (NSBA) proved far more attractive during the early efforts of trustees to organize. However, the NSBA had, and has, a very clear focus on the kindergarten through grade twelve (K-12) common school district. This must be put in a historical light.

Many K-12 districts, between 1900 and 1959, had added grades 13 and 14 and called the result a junior college. Later these junior colleges evolved into something quite different, and their basic interests became different from the common K-12 schools which had parented them. There was a steady move all across the nation for the new colleges to organize away from the parent K-12 districts. The K-12 parentage, however, proved important to trustees at first, and it was within the NSBA that substantial numbers of trustees sought a home--indeed they were often both directors of K-12 districts and of the junior college. The period from 1965 to 1972 marked the greatest extent of this interest.

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) was another matter. The AACJC presented peculiar attractions and problems.

First, its singular interest, community college education, was clearly recognized. Second, it had been a most important national association throughout most of the years in which community colleges were developing. Founded in 1920 and beginning operations in 1921, this association had gained importance and strength as the field it served grew and matured.

Forum and Focus, a book by Brick, traced the early development of AACJC.[3] A more recent monograph, The Council of Universities and Colleges--an Introductory History by Meek and Morgan examined AACJC from the perspective of a council affiliated with AACJC.[4] The development of councils within the AAJCJ organization may have been a fatal move as regards AACJC attracting and holding a trustee association within that body.

In the most recent reorganization of AACJC, culminating in 1972, councils were encouraged to form around special interest groups such as graduate

professors (Council of Universities and Colleges) or trustees (Council of trustees). These councils, once formed, would seek official recognition by AACJC and exist in a satellite arrangement with the possibility of having membership on the AACJC Board of Directors. This possibility had proven attractive to some community college trustees, and a Council of Trustees was formed and functioned prior to the formation of AACT.

It was logical that the trustees would be interested in the AACJC. That association had, increasingly during the 1960s, encouraged college presidents to bring trustees with them to the annual conventions. By 1965, at St. Louis, there were sizable numbers of these trustees in evidence. One problem with this arrangement surfaced. Presidents, who represented the member colleges and voted for them, dominated AACJC meetings. These presidents were once again called on at AACJC meetings to explain "educational things" to the trustees. Trustees did not sense the need to go to an annual convention to be schooled by employees that they, themselves, had hired.

In spite of the attractions of the existing AGB and of maintaining fledgling relations with AACJC and NSBA, another consideration emerged: trustees could go it alone! The thought occurred that they could form their own association; one responsive to their distinctive needs.

Such a move would first require a separation from NSBA since it was within this group that the urge to organize first found voice. It was, then, the NSBA Council of Community College Boards which served as the base for what has become the Association of Community College Trustees.

Independent Status Announced

A ringing reminder and pledge that "Service Is Its Own Reward" signified the end of the relationship of community college trustees with the NSBA.[5] This was made on April 15, 1972. Details of how and why this move was made are carried in some detail in Part III of this work. The impact, though not thoroughly understood, on trustees has to be judged as positive in terms of what subsequently developed.

By leaving the sponsoring NSBA, ACCT followed in the footsteps of that parent. NSBA had separated earlier from the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) which in turn had separated from the National Education Association (NEA). These moves, both by NSBA and ACCT, give credence to the statement that there is a powerful urge of citizen educators to remove them-

selves some distance from associations developed initially to serve professional educators. This may explain subsequent relations between ACCT and the AACJC--the latter having been heavily dominated for years by community college presidents.

When trustees made this move they did it virtually without funds. There was also a relatively small membership--113 members to be exact. There was also a competitor organization, albeit a friently one, in the form of the AACJC Council of Trustees.

In spite of grave risks and other attractions, the decision was made for community college trustees to secede from the NSBA and not to join AACJC--though the AACJC had succeeded in forming a trustee council of its own. Looked at realistically, it was an act of courage. This move was a clear reaffirmation of faith that the trustees had in themselves as well as the colleges they served. In fact the move was described in terms of "faith" by Meardy:[5]

> Just prior to the crucial vote on separation last April in San Francisco, Mr. Ed. Sloan, Trustee, Columbus Technical Institute, asked, "Bill, how do you know that an independent association can survive?" That was a good question. Unfortunately, we could not respond with a proof-positive answer.
>
> The only thing we could say was, "Trustees possess an unlimited amount of faith."

New Boards for New Colleges

It is important to note quickly that an inescapable part of any American community college is the controlling board with citizen educators on it. There is a blur in some Canadian provinces between ministry and purely citizen representation, but none such in the United States. In both countries, citizens are either elected from, or appointed from, a specified constituency. Either way, the resultant lay board in higher education is, according to Gallagher (long time president of the City Colleges of New York) a unique feature of American higher education.[6]

It may be equally important to point out early, and to emphasize, that a critical difference exists between university and community college boards. Jencks and Reisman have written that a revolution occurred within American universities when control over these institutions was effectively wrested away from lay boards by academicians creating departments and emphasizing the primacy of disciplines and research.[7] Nothing like this has occurred in the community colleges which, incidentally, the Harvard-based Jencks and Reisman have described somewhat contemptuously as "antiuniversity institu-

tions." In community colleges, generally, lay boards remain firmly in control. This control may be challenged by militant faculties and by presidents with dominant personalities at any one college, but, on the whole, the boards have and maintain control over what their colleges will do.

College boards are also not like corporation boards. The difference is that corporation boards are dominated by the profit motive--they are expected to make the bottom line of the ledger read in black ink. Educational institution boards, on the other hand and in particular in the public sector, are profit consuming in a monetary sense. The goals are the achievement of societal ambitions and the utilization of society's resources (taxes) to gain such goals. This distinction prohibits boards from managing poorly; the closer to their communities that colleges get, the more immediate is the matter of accountability (more is said about this in Chapter Two). Note:[8]

> The day of trustee non-involvement is over! (Emphasis in the original.) Trustees can no longer maintain that their most important mission is the recruitment of the chief administrator and then back-off. The day of "Accountability" will no longer allow that luxury.

It is also reasonable that college boards are expected by the society which created them to be responsible for the use of social resources. In some states these lay boards are personally responsible for the debts of community colleges. This is an enormous expectation and responsibility to pass on to citizen educators, and they are often nervous about both their exposure and their own role in what sometimes can be perceived as a hostile environment.

Very quickly it must be added that citizens have been willing to take the risks. At the same time they are proud of their work, their role and the institutions they serve. They are converts, as often as not, to the great philosophical ideal of extending postsecondary education more broadly and more equally. Board members can also be the source of frustration for some administrators:[9]

> On being asked what the principal responsibility the board had to a community college president, a trustee from the State of Washington replied, "Remind him constantly that he has no tenure!" On the other hand one of the finest young presidents known (also from Washington) will growl frequently, "Boards and trouble are synonymous. I'd just as soon work with a den of rattlesnakes!" This young president has not been fired nor has he left in a huff and has been working with his

> particular "den of snakes" for nearly ten years. The point is, of course, that neither he nor the trustees have any other choice than to work with each other.

This points to a truism which will be repeated. Boards exist because the public insists on having them.

New Trustees

The growth of community colleges in the United States has been nothing less than spectacular. The greatest expansion was from 1960 to 1970, and Wilson, of AACJC, noted in 1970 at a conference which examined the role of trustees:[10]

> During the last ten years the numerical growth of community college trustees has even surpassed the amazing growth of community and junior colleges. This is a consequence of two happenings. In the first place, new institutions with local governing boards of five members or more have been established. Secondly, a sizeable number of junior colleges were separated from K-12 school districts and placed under the direction of separate boards.

Wilson went on to observe that it was not possible to generalize about what these new trustees would be required to do on the basis of trustee responsibilities in other kinds of higher educational institutions. The

> . . .shift from traditional views and objectives of 'higher education' to more comprehensive, community-based purposes and activities, has set community college trustees apart from trustees of other colleges and universities.

Beyond the matters of expansion of numbers of trustees and the shifts in the goals and missions of the colleges they served, are the personal concerns of trustees. These frequently center on exposure. Exposure is not just legalistic. It is also a matter of recurring fears of being made to look like a fool by not understanding what is going on while occupying a very public platform. Exposure also presents political possibilities--positive as well as negative.

Protection is a many faceted problem for citizen educators. It goes beyond militant faculty, activist students and controversial guest speakers at the college. Professional educators use an enormous amount of jargon, usually without any meaning at all to the average citizen. This makes it difficult for trustees to understand clearly what is going on or recommended to them, and they are justifiably distrustful on occasion. For example, George Potter, a trustee from Michigan, has written:[11]

> There are some very basic don'ts that every board should follow in negotiating a union contract.

10

1. Don't allow philosophical language to be included in the contract, e.g., "the members of the teaching profession are peculiarly qualified to assist in formulating policies and programs designed to improve educational standards."

This is not to ignore real fiscal and political exposures of the citizen educator. Beyond the fear of looking foolish in the full glare of press and other media coverage of board meetings, there are situations where things go wrong which might have been prevented. It is often not just enough to fire the president. The public may feel the board erred by letting things get out of hand, and there can be political consequences not to the advantage of the trustees. Also, as noted earlier, some states still hold individual board members fiscally responsible for institutional debts!

Out of the disparate background of college administrators, faculty, staff, and trustees, there must emerge a relationship of trust and respect. This is the best protection for all. This is easy to talk about, however, and most difficult to achieve. It remains the best possible foundation for a healthy institution. Too often an institution can be seen as floundering once this trustful relationship has disappeared. Trustees, presidents and others come and go with dreary predictability in such situations. Given how dynamic community colleges have been, it is a marvel that there has been the amount of stability evident; and, it is also a credit to those involved.

Summary

Some major developments related to the formation of the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) have been briefly considered. The suggestion was made that the central reason ACCT came into being was that trustees insisted on an association of their own--one run by themselves for themselves. Several available alternative associations were considered and passed by.

The continuing need for ACCT seems to flow from trustee concerns for enlightenment, support and protection. Increasing numbers of community colleges are doing increasing numbers of things, and they need the services of an increasing number of citizen educators picked by various processes to serve on governing boards.

Acceptance of a trustee position brings with it a commitment of time and energy as well as personal and political risks. All of this is done, most commonly, with no financial remuneration at all. Why do people do it? This question has never been answered to the satisfaction of all, and it may just be best to assume that there are good and valid reasons for people to get so

involved and work so hard.

Following this brief introduction which raised more questions than it answered, there are chapters dealing with the rise of community colleges, the need for boards, some characteristics and perspectives of board members, and finally, historical details on how trustees got ACCT up and going.

Footnotes to Chapter One:

1. Konrad, A.B.: "Community College Boards; A Canadian Perspective," New Directions for Community Colleges. Summer 1975.

2. American Association of Junior Colleges; Junior Colleges: 50 States/50 Years. (Yarrington, ed) Washington D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges. 1969.

3. Brick, M.: Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement: The American Association of Junior Colleges. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University. 1964.

4. Meek, D. and Morgan, D.: Council of Universities and Colleges: An Introductory History. Tucson: University of Arizona. March 1977.

5. For Community College Trustees. ACCT Occasional Newsletter. Winnetka, Illinois. June 1972.

6. Gallagher, B.C.: "Who Runs the Institution?: Proceedings of a Conference. Denver: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education. December 1966.

7. Jencks, C. and Reisman, D.: The Academic Revolution. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday. 1969.

8. Meardy, W.: "Editorial," Advisor VII, Issue 6, Washington D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees. Undated.

9. Morgan, D.: "The Junior College Board of Trustees and the President: A Report of a National Survey." The Junior College Board of Trustees, B. Lamar Johnson, editor. Los Angeles: University of California. February 1971, p. 30.

10. Wilson, R.: "Introduction: "Trustee Papers 1 (Wilson and Harper, editors) Washington D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Fall 1973, p. 5.

11. Potter, G." "Board versus Faculty: Collective Bargaining," Trustee Papers 1, Ibid. p. 13.

CHAPTER TWO

The Platform

Why do community colleges exist? It may shock those intimately involved with them that others in 1982 are still asking that question.[1] The answer to why they exist is almost too simple, though it has been there all the time for all to see. They exist to extend access to education--in particular to quality education beyond the high school. This is especially important for people who otherwise might be denied such opportunity.

Translating basic purpose into action can present formidable problems, and the next set of questions is more difficult. Why is an extension of education beyond the high school desirable? Why would community colleges concern themselves with this when there are other post-secondary institutions available and with many of them suffering from sagging enrollments? Who benefits? Students surely. Society hopefully. The result of additional education or training as offered in community colleges may only perpetuate rather than change a society in which economic inequalities persist.[2] However, the very fact that these new two-year institutions seem to be designed to serve society rather than change it may account in part for why they have been so successful.

It may be helpful if a brief of what these colleges are, or think they are, is presented. In the final analysis, they will be judged by what they accomplish and no more. However, some indication of what they see as their business and how they go about trying to accomplish it should be brought to light. An understanding of the basic platform from which community college trustees operate will be enhanced. However, no detailed examination of the development of community colleges is presented, and the reader who wants to delve more deeply in this area is referred first to one of the better though dated introductory texts, The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis. A much less detailed and easily read treatment can be found in This Is The Community College. An interesting and provocative critique which focuses on some modern problems can be found in Dateline 79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College.

A particularly worthwhile introductory text on the community college for trustees is one written by someone from their own ranks. Mary Lou Zoglin's Power and Politics in the Community College written in 1976 is straightforward and readable. Zoglin has served both on local and state level community college boards.

Unique?

The statement recurs in the literature on community colleges that they are "unique." On close examination, however, it can be seen that each of the things they do is also done by other kinds of institutions. What is the difference, if any? The difference is found in the matter of priorities and the combination of services. Though other institutions can be seen as doing one or more of the things community colleges attempt, no other institution tries to do all the particular things that community colleges do from the same basic attitudes and processes.

Uniqueness, then flows from a demonstrated ability to convert an attitude and a process into performance. The basic attitude is that students and the local communities from which they are drawn will be given first priority and first call on services.

Though it is not always easy to prove, these colleges claim to be "open door" and admit any who can benefit from what is offered. Further, there are no community needs that will not be acknowledged and met if possible.

The basic process centers on flexibility. Stated simply, colleges feel free to shift emphasis when this becomes desirable or necessary. The shifts are influenced by the needs of students and their communities. Yet there are built in quality controls and checks on the meaningfulness of what is taught.

A 20th Century Phenomenon

Community colleges are clearly a twentieth century phenomenon. While there are philosophical roots extending deeply into the nineteenth century and earlier,[3] the first public junior colleges appeared at the dawn of the twentieth century. These new institutions steadily evolved into what are now commonly called community colleges--a generic term which includes junior and technical colleges as well as two-year branch campuses of universities.

Each state has organized the governance system for these colleges somewhat differently. Some two-year operations function well under university trustees (e.g., Hawaii), and some are under state K-12 boards (Oregon), and there is one technical-community system under local but not K-12 control (Nebraska).

Only Wisconsin has no community college system of any type. Even in Wisconsin, however, there are post-secondary technical institutes addressing some community college functions. And there is a two-year "center" system functioning much as earlier "junior" colleges did, but they are under the same trustees which govern the University of Wisconsin.

The First "Junior" Colleges

It must be remembered that those first public junior colleges appearing in the early 1900's were essentially extensions of high schools, and meant to serve as alternative entrance avenues into universities. The universities expected that "junior" would sift out the poorly prepared without costing the university anything—the parent K-12 districts financed these colleges from local sources. It was even hoped by some of the early major philosopher/educators (all university presidents) that "junior" might come to handle all lower division work so that universities might evolve into something approaching the University of Heidelberg, a convenient example of the Anglo-Germanic elitist university.

The early result for "junior" colleges was that many new people were offered postsecondary education. Unfortunately, they often had problems in transferring because of the imposition of university standards plus greater tuition and living costs at the university level. This early emphasis on university level work by the "juniors" has left the public with an unclear notion of what community colleges are now all about.

The new institution generated pressures on themselves by offering new hope to many. They then resolved these pressures by introducing new services. Said simply, these services were for those for whom alternatives other than the university were desirable or necessary. They focused first on vocational education.

As early as 1928, California (for example) passed enabling legislation for the inclusion of vocational education within the new public junior colleges.[4] It was not at first a perfect fit, but it was a very good one, even from the start. An immediate result was that people who had no urge to go to the university, or perhaps neither the money nor an adequate preparation, could then engage in training which could lead directly to employment. Getting jobs for people has always been a popular thing to do.

As might be predicted, the universities did not automatically appreciate the new institution's moving away from concentration on free services rendered the university, nor did it appreciate a new competitor for tax monies at the state level. A good description of the resulting conflict-ridden situation which still prevails between many universities and community colleges can be found in a recent Council of Universities and Colleges monograph by Sharon McLaren. She concluded that this conflict may not be harmful presently to community colleges.[5] Another conclusion is inevitable, and it is that universities still do not understand what has happened to the former "juniors."

Both high schools and universities still offer services paralleling those found in community colleges. Technically adult education in California, for example, has been restricted by law as a function of the high school district, and land grant universities through their agriculture and home economics extension programs have clearly been working within communities on a non-credit basis for some time. Yet community colleges in California developed programs parallel to both the K-12 adult programs and the university extension effort. Care must be taken in making claims that community colleges are uniquely endowed to perform some services better than other institutions and should be extending services endlessly. It is a wise community college which first assesses what other educational institutions, plus community agencies, are doing and doing well and then not committing themselves in those service areas. There is yet plenty not done by any institution.

The claim to uniqueness then rests on two principle cases. First, the institution has an unusually supportive attitude towards the consumer; and second, the institution will remain flexible in order to deal with the first position. Both of these positions have constant pressures against them. Three of the major pressures visible now are:

1) state level bureaucracies which increasingly have gained control over community colleges--the danger being that additional layers of bureaucratization inevitably lead to less flexibility and less local input, (one state reacted by cancelling a state office charged with supervising community colleges[6]);

2) continuing failure of elements in the community college faculty to accept vocational and community education programs and that the university is no longer the prime reason for existence; and

3) increasing tuition--this danger is the more insidious as it restricts entrance of lower economic groups who are often those who have benefited the most in the past.

The combination of tuition pressures, plus the dwindling marketability of liberal arts degrees, had led to a curious phenomenon in the vocational technical programs of community colleges. It is called the "reverse transfer." Substantial numbers of students holding B.A. degrees now seek entrance into vocational programs at the freshman level. While this looks at first glance like success, this can and must be questioned. It is one thing for a Nebraska technical community college to note with pride that 26 freshmen in vocational programs had college degrees and another for them to consider who was kept out of vocational programs by admitting these new kinds of students. These new

"reverse transfers" have more resources at their command than the typical vocational program student.

Present Programs and Characteristics

Modern community colleges have come to offer some combination of the following kinds of programs, and many attempt all of them (as can be seen by checking almost any community college catalogue):

1) vocational technical education as preparation for immediate entry into an occupation.

2) university parallel (transfer) as meeting up to two years of university lower division work and with transfer to a university planned.

3) general education which can be taken for personal enrichment (e.g., art appreciation) or in support of either vocational or transfer programs (e.g., mathematics or communication skills).

4) adult, extended day or community service programs meant simply to address, on a credit or credit free basis, the needs of both individuals and communities in vocational, university or general education.

Almost equally important are the functions or characteristics of these institutions as they strive to perform the above. They offer:

1) a teaching-student orientation rather than research-publication orientation (perhaps why universities do not understand them).

2) strong counseling or advising functions (both by faculties and by specially trained counselors).

3) low tuition (always under dire threat).

4) accessibility (commuter colleges serving distinct area which eliminates board and room costs).

5) flexible instructional and evaluation methods (increasing experimentation with multi-media approaches based on needs of individuals who may possess extensive competencies of their own brought from years of experience outside education and who have unique learning patterns).

6) advisory committees drawn from industry and commerce (this to keep programs in touch with occupational opportunity).

The programs and functions listed above answer the questions of what community colleges are, what they do, and how they go about doing it. This is, admittedly, at a very general and simplistic level.

The sixth function given above deserves more attention. Community colleges maintain direct relationships with the industrial and business communities through the use of advisory committees. Citizen representatives are drawn

directly from the world of business and industry to recommend, approve, or disapprove requests for the creation of educational programs and the hiring of specifically qualified personnel to staff them. Such a practice, in vocational program areas, is often demanded by state master plans. This practice of citizen involvement creates a situation almost the antithesis of the classical university which historically attempted to wall the commerical community out in order to concentrate on purely academic affairs.

Rouche has drawn additional comparisons between postsecondary institutions:[7]

> The community college movement in the United States developed alongside the existing framework for higher education rather than within it. . . .
>
> The university and the four-year college are characterized by selectivity. Their highly structured, traditional programs are available only to those who possess high academic qualifications and can afford the high cost of those programs.
>
> The two-year college on the other hand has adopted a philosophy of educational opportunity for all--all abilities, all social and economic classes, all interests, all ages.
>
> Often referred to as "democracy's college" the community college is the product of societal demands for greater educational opportunity for all citizens. Therefore, it is more closely identified with "local" societal needs than is any other segment of higher education.

Sometimes it seems as though the sum of what community colleges are and why they exist is the best kept secret in the educational world. At least one trustee also is aware of this. Yancy Williams, a trustee from San Jose, California, observed:[8]

> The rapidly changing nature of American social and cultural patterns has placed heavy demands and expectations on our system of public education, particularly postsecondary education. This writer shares the opinion of many that the community and junior colleges are in the forefront of meeting these challenges. Unfortunately, this opinion is only slightly recognized by the general public and particularly by city, state, and federal officials who legislate and administer in many areas that affect our functioning. Most of them look upon us as a "junior" college that is a second rate stepping-stone to institutions of higher learning for those with academic deficiencies or economic conditions that prevent them from qualifying for entrance to the state colleges and universities. In general, they fail to recognize the diversified and comprehensive needs that are and can be met by community colleges.

Comprehensiveness, Community, and Boards

Two concepts have gained wide usage in community college language. They also have had wide influence on what these institutions attempt to do. They are comprehensiveness and community. A brief expansion on them is needed as they relate to boards and trustees.

Comprehensiveness. Reduced to essentials, a comprehensive program assesses the abilities, aspirations, motivations, and resources of individuals and then attempts to generate programs for them or place them in on-going programs where they have the maximum chance of success. Success is usually defined in terms of the individuals being able to profit from the assessments (counseling), education and training offered.

Profit for the student can be immediate or long-range, personal or economic. For example, a comprehensive agricultural program could reach from teaching people how to drive a tractor (perhaps displaced farm "stoop laborers") to how to design a better tractor (mechanical engineering). This would be an economic gain. A personal gain might be as varied as music or art appreciation to writing memoirs.

Further, in a comprehensive program, any individual should be able to proceed through the entire breadth of it. For example, ex-stoop laborers should be able, theoretically as well as actually, to become engineers. Equally important, but more difficult to achieve, is a situation where a student aspires to be a mechanical engineer but cannot pass calculus. Counseling within a comprehensive curricula makes it possible to encourage this student into other areas offering greater chances for success in perhaps learning how to drive a tractor rather than trying fruitlessly to be an engineer.

Community. The community, for any community college, is usually thought of as a commuting distance. In reality this can mean an area of downtown blocks in a densely populated urban area (Compton College in Watts, California, or Loop College in Chicago) or it can mean a radius of hundreds of miles in some sparsely populated regions (Blue Mountain College in Pendleton, Oregon, or Northern Nevada College in Elko). Dormitories are not ordinarily a part of a community college campus. It is a commuting college serving a distinct, if varied, community.

Although the community college curriculum can and should reflect local needs, it will not be necessarily restricted by this practice. There is ample evidence of ever increasing occupational mobility in the American working force. Individuals trained in one area cannot expect or be expected to necessarily remain in the local area throughout their productive years. The joy is that the educated become a national resource by virtue of their education and skills.

The Board

Community college boards offer a frame of reference for communication with and translation of local needs. Board members are drawn directly from the community. They seem to sympathize with and to appreciate the purposes of comprehensive colleges. They also have feelings about output--perhaps akin to the "bottom line" in the accounting ledgers they know more about. The output is, very briefly, what it is that happens to customers who bought the credits. This is by way of answering the earlier question about who benefits? Spencer observed:[9]

> The schools, in brief, seem to be interested in teaching everything except students. The emphasis is on subjects, not people, and the principal measurement of the effort is not whether this student emerged from his educational program as a potentially successful adult, but whether he satisfied the degree or diploma requirements.
>
> Yet, it is apparent that millions of students march to a different drummer . . . not out of a desire to be different, a refusal to conform, but because our schools and colleges do not serve their needs.
>
> The junior colleges seem to me to offer our best chance to stimulate genuinely fresh investigations, and then do something about the answers. Free of the rigid traditions which tie most schools and senior colleges to their administrative and instructional arrangements, junior colleges can tinker with all sorts of new ideas and put them to work in their classrooms.

And Rouche has expanded on this in another way:[10]

> The concept of accountability suggests that we stop counting the number of volumes in the library, quit measuring the square footage per full-time student, and immediately start looking at how well students are being taught.
>
> For too long, college trustees have deferred to college administrators on all educational matters. Typically, board members spend full board meetings; attending committee meetings; attending ad-hoc meetings of college groups; making speeches on behalf of the college; soliciting funds; recruiting students; and holding personal conferences with college personnel.
>
> It is important to remind board members that community colleges are established to facilitate effective teaching. Two-year colleges have long claimed to be "superior" teaching institutions, a claim which has not been substantiated, by the way. The community college is not supported merely to provide employment for teachers; indeed, teachers are needed only to cause learning. . . .
>
> Community colleges can and must be accountable to the communities that support them. Boards of trustees must assume the evaluation role so desperately needed now. I am convinced that the community college can make good on its promise to educate all persons, provided that it adopts a policy of accountability.

This is a bold suggestion when viewed against past suggestions of educators that boards be kept out of the functions of the institutions they serve. It is time now to look at trustees directly--their nature and function as they operate

within American comprehensive community colleges. Who benefits? The best of all possible answers would be--students.

Summary

A brief overview of why we have community colleges has been presented. This was done to present the platform on which trustees are called to operate and it was not intended to be definitive. Those wishing to dig deeper into the history and development of community colleges have been referred to the few good texts on that subject.

Why do community colleges exist? They exist to extend educational opportunity--particularly educational opportunity beyond the high school. How do they do this? They do it best by establishing comprehensive programs anchored in calculated flexibility. They do it best by keeping a strong anchor in the local community and strong communication ties with it.

Footnotes to Chapter Two:

1. Zwerling, L.: Second Best - The Crises of the Community College. McGraw Hill, 1976.

2. Jencks, C. et al.: Inequality. New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1972.

3. Brick, M.: Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement: The American Association of Junior Colleges. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University. 1964.

4. MacLaren, S.: Community College - University Relations: An Examination of the Positive Functions of Conflict. Stillwater, Oklahoma and Washington, D.C.: Oklahoma State University and the Council of Universities and Colleges of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

5. MacLaren. Ibid.

6. Paradise, M.: "The Community College and the State Government," ACCT Trustee Quarterly. Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees. Winter 1976-77. p. 18.

7. Rouche, J.: "Accountability for Student Learning: A Board Responsibility," The Junior College Board of Trustees. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, University of California. February 1971, p. 12.

8. Williams, Y.: "Sleeping Giant of Legislative Advocacy," Trustee Papers 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1973. p. 32.

9. Spencer, L.: "A Publisher Looks at Innovation," Innovation. Palo Alto, California: Science Research Associates. 1967. p. 9.

10. Rouche, J.: "Accountability for Student Learning: A Board Responsibility," The Junior College Board of Trustees. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, University of California. February 1971, p. 14.

PART TWO:

BOARDS AND TRUSTEES--WHY, WHO AND HOW

Chapter Three: Function and Role
Chapter Four: Characteristics and Perspectives

CHAPTER THREE

Function and Role

To ask why community colleges have trustees is not just a rhetorical question. There is nothing remotely like them in most countries of the world. In the first place most countries do not have community colleges as found in North America. In the second place most other countries control education from a highly centralized national ministry where bureaucrats and not citizens reign.

As community colleges seek to extend educational opportunity on a broad scale, they give first priority to serving the immediate educational needs of individuals and communities. It has always been the conviction of the U.S. public that public education is just too big a job to trust to professionals, and this public demands some form of citizen advice and control over educational institutions.

Americans have never trusted professionals in any social or political arena. This is rightly so! For example, U.S. diplomats are organized under civilian leadership, denied epaulets or uniforms and expected to dress (and hopefully act) in the mold of citizen Benjamin Franklin and not to forget that the citizenry is the boss. The Department of Defense also is headed by non-military civilians, although the separation of military and industry has been very clouded of late. Similarly American schools are headed by citizen governing committees. In post-secondary education they are usually called boards of trustees. The public simply insists on having them.

The parallel drawn here between defense and education is not accidental--war is far too important to leave entirely in the hands of generals and the education of the nation's young is far too important to leave in the hands of educators. Wilson offered a similar conclusion after raising a different kind of question:[1]

> . . .the value of part-time trustees is a legitimate and significant question. Unfortunately, the alternatives usually proposed are even less satisfactory. The alternative of centralization at a higher level, usually in state boards and office, undermines local support and responsiveness. The Carnegie Commission report specifically recommends against strong state systems and advises the approximately dozen states with highly centralized state systems to decentralize. Another alternative is to eliminate boards of lay people and rely on the professional educators. But most people agree that education is too important to be left in the control of educators.

In either case, defense or education, professionals are enlisted by civilians to get the job done. In both cases the public, civilians, expects to determine

just what the job is that is to be done! To return to a point made earlier, the principal reason for having trustees is that the public insists on them.

The lay board can be viewed as a kind of a sieve through which social ambitions and requirements are translated and passed on to the institution involved—be it a hospital or college. Historically, as relates to colleges, society has directed educational services be delivered to distinct age groups. However, community colleges have dramatically widened the notion of what constitutes the "college" age group. They seek to serve all in the community where the college is located and from which students are drawn as well as the community itself.

Regardless of specific or widening goals or missions involving different needs and populations, community college boards are charged with the governance of very special educational institutions. Governance involves legitimization. Said another way, society transfers to governing boards the right to, and the responsibility for operating social institutions—in this case the community college.

Unique Colleges Require Unique Advisors

Community colleges, in addition to having trustees to guide them, also typically invite advisors directly from the business and industrial worlds to help them devise programs and to give information on placement of graduates. This, as noted earlier, is the direct opposite of practices found at universities which historically have sought to wall themselves in to keep away from the "baseness" of the market place in order to better protect academic freedom, among other things.

A major source of trustees is the business world (see Chapter Four). Inviting additional people from the same perspective to serve on program advisory committees would seem to court potential problems of some magnitude. Problems do arise when people are invited into important positions within operations they may not understand fully.

Also if you ask for someone's opinion, in all likelihood you are going to get an opinion—particularly on matters relating to education. Nearly all citizens have been put through the experience and most have strong opinions about it. However, information from the "real" world is not only helpful, but essential, if the community colleges are to have a good chance to do what it is they say they are prepared to do.

In all fairness it must be noted that a major source of public discontent with education stems from the personal experiences many individuals have suf-

fered in the formal educational processes. The education imposed on many (including trustees and other college advisors) has created frustrations for many, and disillusionment for others, since that which they were made to endure did not seem related to the practicality of their lives. The initial result may be that both trustees to serve on boards and advisors to consult on programs arrive at the community college with axes to grind, either personal or political.

Community college boards and administrators are then faced routinely with direct community and commercial pressures which their university counterparts rarely experience. For example, academic freedom and tenure are both foreign concepts to the "bottom line" reality of the market place. Yet community college boards and administrators are expected to understand, defend, and support these educational concepts without the benefit of protection provided by walls—physical or academic. The matter of tenure seems to bother the trustees the most.[2]

Whatever their personal motives, trustees are expected to be responsible for operations which can be large scale and in which politics play a large part. This requires them to serve as a bridge between the "real" world and the "unreal" one. They are often quite adept at this and are also aware of their skills. Williams, a trustee from California, notes:[3]

> Trustees, if they will exercise it, have the power, the know-how and the influence to impact on community college support at local, state and national levels. Whether by a telephone call to the mayor, a confrontation with a state legislator, or a march on Washington, Board members can make the points that are necessary for generating action in support of community colleges. What I have described as approaches to the task only scratch the surface.

Wise community college administrators are also aware of this, and one of the more successful community college presidents once observed:[4]

> . . .the board members are politically more astute, usually, than either the faculty or the administration. Trade on this . . . . First, however, the board must understand clearly, in terms they can handle and understand, what the college is and what its needs are likely to be (emphasis in original).

Roles and Functions New and Old

With the foregoing as introduction, what are the specific responsibilities of community college boards? P. Cameron DeVore, formerly a trustee in the Seattle Community College District, suggested a very critical examination be made of the following historical roles set for boards:[5]

1. The choice and continuing support of the president; perhaps the most crucial, central concern of lay boards of trustees.

2. With the assistance of the president, the establishment of the principal purposes and policies of the school.

3. As title holders or trustees of its property, the preservation of the assets of the institution and approval of its budgets.

4. Serving as a court of final appeal in a variety of governance and personal matters.

DeVore went on to observe that these classic roles are not really too different from those facing university or K-12 board members. He challenged those roles by observing there were primary differences within the realm of community colleges which set them apart from universities or K-12 districts.

The differences DeVore thought important were:[6]

> 1) the complexity of the community college approach--especially its attempt to broaden access and to promote a nearly bewildering array of programs geared to long-term and immediate needs of students;
>
> 2) the genesis of state systems which threaten local autonomy and increase bureaucracy; and
>
> 3) the matter of "power seekers"--be they students, faculty, elements from the community or "others" . . . demanding that they and their student allies be given power to operate institutions. . . .

Towards an activist board: It is important to note DeVore wrote this for presentation in 1970 a time of considerable student and community unrest and activist movements in Seattle. Some intense pressures were directed upon Seattle Community College which he represented as a trustee at that time. However, as it was a time for deep and considered thought, DeVore seemed up to it. He continued his remarks by suggesting trustees mount some "demands" of their own:[7]

> a. Improved educational accountability that will allow a "success rating" to be applied to the institution. How many students were graduated? Did they find jobs? Where? How many studnets completed classes for which they enrolled?
>
> b. An overhaul of the traditional--and antiquated--educational personnel practices that perpetuate mediocrity. Examples: tenure and step-lane salary schedules.
>
> c. Improved clarity and precision in communications, sounding the death knell for "pedagese."
>
> d. A vastly expanded program to utilize college resources and facilities including libraries, meeting rooms, dining

halls, and study areas. The era of monument building may be behind us.

e. Effective performance evaluation programs for all employees, including faculty.

Though he concluded by noting that none of his challenges to the classic roles of the board had altered any of its responsibilities, it can be seen that what he actually proposed was a proliferation of responsibilities. In sum, he proposed an "activist" board.

Historic Perspective of Boards

This modern "activist" trustee position must be contrasted with earlier writings about what boards ought to do, most of it written by professional educators. This literature appears to have evolved through three approximate stages:

1. First stage: keep the board out of college affairs as they are hopeless amateurs.

2. Second stage: involve the board only on broad policy matters, which includes the chief responsibility of hiring a chief administrator.

3. Third and present stage: involve the board totally whether they wish to be or not.

It should be noted that this was a literature developed about, and not from, trustees.

The first stage, paternalistic at its core and pertinent for other institutions in other eras and circumstances, was reflected by Hughes who wrote in 1951:[8]

> . . .(trustees) are called upon to govern an enterprise whose major and most significant tasks they could not possibly themselves perform or in some cases even understand for lack of the intensive specialized training involved.

Hughes had also written in 1945:[9]

> The duties and services of trustees are of three kinds: (1) things not to do. . . .

This statement probably represents the extreme position of those who would keep boards passive or silent. Imagine starting a list of board responsibilities by noting first what they are not to do!

The second stage is reflected in Rislov's assertion in 1964 that the boards's principal responsibilities were:[10]

> (1) to confirm the objectives of the institution; (2) to adopt policies intended to realize these objectives;

(3) to evaluate or appraise the results of the policies.

Also in 1964 Newburn stated, as have many since:[11]

> Possibly the most important single activity conducted by any board of trustees is the selection of the chief executive officer for the college or university under its direction.

As DeVore suggested, this classic role still applies but it would be in error to think the board will, or should, limit itself to this activity, now or in the future. For example, Mary Lou Zoglin, a trustee, recently stated:[12]

> The literature contains very few guidelines to proper board-faculty relations. What does exist can be summed up in one sentence: "Don't do it except via the president." This is so patently unrealistic (emphasis added) that it serves only to point up the need for developing more satisfactory techniques. One problem is that trustees and teachers interact in several totally different ways and any guidelines must take into account this very complex set of relationships. As a first step, we need to explore some of the various ways in which board members and faculty relate to each other.

At least two recent studies reflect the recent trend to involve the board as far as it wishes to go. Gilliland and Nunnery, though stressing that their study was limited as it reflected only the view of trustees who were "Southern and rural or small town by heritage" and "overwhelmingly white and male," advanced some very strong arguments:[13]

> Since the trustees were generally well educated, fairly well read, active in community organizations, and highly supporting of the junior college philosophy, administrators can reasonably expect the trustees to understand the complex issues in junior college administration and make meaningful contributions to the resolution of these issues.

Also boards increasingly have their own views of why they exist and Sam Kelly, a trustee, quoted a colleague as having said:[14]

> The student and faculty often seem to think we (trustees) live in the past, the remote past; administration sees us as in the present, present at sequential board meetings and now and again study sessions. I'd like to view myself as a long-range planner, concerned with today's operation of course, but also using what is entrusted to us to build the necessary programs, policies, procedures and services that our best current information tells us will be needed in a decade or more.

This is the precise reason to have trustees—to represent society and to translate its needs into a set of realistic plans for a college to then struggle to achieve. Trustees, however, to come full circle as professionals in their own right, must expose themselves to some kind of evaluation process. Their job is too important to be performed beyond scrutiny.

Summary

Why have boards of trustees? Stated simply, boards are created to govern. They do so in the name of society. Put broadly, this governance function evokes responsibilities related to aspirations for society and the wise use of social resources. Boards help translate social goals into educational goals possible to achieve with some degree of efficiency in any one circumstance. A trustee, Frieda Simon, emphasized both why and how:[15]

> Local actions and decisions must remain a trustee's major concern. If he does not participate effectively here, helping to shape and guide the development of his college, he is derelict in his duty to the citizens who elected him. Besides there is no one else to perform this task. Either it will not be done, or by default, it will be done by persons not directly responsible to the electors (emphasis in original).

Boards accept the need for development--student development, program development and staff development. They also accept the need for evaluation of performance--student, program and staff. They are on the way to helping each other regarding development of themselves (gaining and sharing new information), and this was one of the prime reasons the ACCT came into existence. However, the matter of evaluation of board members lags, though attention to it is increasing. Konrad, in particular, wrote:[16]

> Will trusteeship be improved? The thesis of this paper argues that evaluation results can be helpful in describing the nature and functioning of college boards and, potentially, lead to their improvement. Some college boards have implemented worthwhile procedures for evaluation. Others will probably never do so, secure in their belief that they already know that they are doing a "good" job and data to the contrary could only emerge if persons with a "distorted" view of reality were allowed to participate in some form of evaluation. Still others are prepared to take a look at themselves in the role of trustee and are open to find ways of improving their effectiveness.

Reference is made in the next chapter to a study of trustees by Drake in 1977. For now, it is important to note she found boards increasingly willing to consider formal evaluation of themselves.

The conclusion here is that if board "leadership" is to continue to emerge, as compared with the "followship" of the past, boards must come to know not only what is expected of them but invite measures of how well they are doing it. The prospect of returning to past practices is just too dismal. For example, when asked to nominate leaders in the community college field from among presidents he knew, a fine young president once wrote to me,

". . . there really aren't many leaders as most (presidents) are simple expedients striving to keep the roof on and boards happy but ignorant." That was in 1965, and it seems like the dark ages when viewed from the 1980's. However, it may still describe some situations, and it is too often true if true but once.

Footnotes to Chapter Three:

1. Wilson, R.: "Organizing for Work Together II," The Junior College Board of Trustees. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, University of California. February 1971. p. 63.

2. ACCT Senate Minutes. September 27, 1974. Mimeographed. From ACCT files, Washington, D.C.

3. Williams, Y.: "Sleeping Giant of Legislative Advocacy," Trustee Papers 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1973. p. 32.

4. Morgan, D.: Perspectives of the Community College Presidency. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, University of California. March 1970. p. 115.

5. DeVore, P.: "The Role and Responsibilities of Community College Boards of Trustees," The Junior College Board of Trustees. Ibid. p. 7.

6. DeVore, P.: Ibid. p. 8.

7. DeVore, P.: Ibid. p. 10.

8. Hughes, R.: A Manual for Trustees of Colleges and Universities, 2nd Edition. Ames, Iowa: The Collegiate Press, Inc. 1951, p. 173.

9. Hughes, R.: A Manual for Trustees of Colleges and Universities. Ames, Iowa: The Collegiate Press, Inc. 1945. p. 164.

10. Rislov, S.: "The Boards Responsibility," Junior College Journal. September 1964. p. 9.

11. Newburn, H.: "The Board Meets the President," Junior College Journal. November 1964. p. 12.

12. Zoglin, M.: "Board Faculty Relationships," Trustee Papers 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1973. p. 20.

13. Gilliland, J. and Nunnery, M.: "Florida Trustees; Characteristics and Opinions," Junior College Journal. February 1970. p. 26.

14. Kelly, S.: "Alternative Futures: The Trustees Responsibility," Trustee Papers 1. Washington, D.C.: Ibid. p. 37.

15. Simon, F.: "The Tri-Level Trustee," Trustee Papers 1. Ibid. p. 57.

16. Konrad, A.: "Community College Boards; A Canadian Perspective," New Directions for Community Colleges. Summer 1975.

CHAPTER FOUR

Trustees: Characteristics and Perspectives

Not enough is known about how and why community college trustees organize and operate--why they do what they do. There is, however, a small but growing body of information on what they are like (age, sex, etc.). There is also some information about how they feel on select issues, e.g., what are trustee functions and how can trustees best help the president? And there are a few measures of how effective boards are felt to be.

Focusing on the New Trustee

Attention of both legislative and academic bodies was drawn to community colleges increasingly in the 1960s as a result of their growth. It could be expected that some of this attention would spread to the trustees serving these colleges. This proved true. In addition to attention to how these colleges should be organized and governed, there developed a literature about the trustees which served them. A natural outcome was that national and regional conferences were scheduled with trustees as the topic of concern.

One of the first major conferences on community college trustees was organized by B. Lamar Johnson at U.C.L.A. It was held in August of 1970. A monograph of the proceedings was published in 1971 and titled The Junior College Board of Trustees.[1]

The information and views contained in that 1971 monograph had been presented not only by administrators and professors but by board members and by representatives of trustee associations. Both the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC--since renamed American Association of Community and Junior Colleges) and the old Council of Community College Boards (CCCB) of the National School Board Association (NSBA) were represented. The CCCB, as already noted in Chapter One, was the organization which evolved into the present Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT).

A week long workshop for select new trustees was offered in conjunction with the two day 1970 U.C.L.A. national conference. Participation in the workshop was strictly limited to trustees. Some of their perspectives and opinions were recorded during the workshop and reported on at the conference:[2]

1. They believed in the mission of the community college . . .
2. They wanted objective information . . .
3. They felt too dependent on their own executives . . .
4. They were eager . . . to associate with other junior college board members.
5. They were acutely aware of (accountability pressures) . . .

6. They wanted . . . a more positive role in the governance of their colleges.

One of the papers presented on trustees at the 1970 U.C.L.A. conference and included in the published proceedings was by the present writer.[3] It was based on a study begun in 1969 of characteristics and perspectives of community colleges' trustees. The early trustee newsletter, For Community College Trustees, picked up on other aspects of this same study and reported in 1971:[4]

> Some common replies from community college trustees are as follows:
>
> (1) Trustees feel that their contributions to education are consuming much more of their lives than they had bargained for and with very few thanks ever given in return.
>
> (2) Average size of (public community college boards is) 7.6 persons (range of 5 to 16 persons).
>
> (3) Largest boards represented were in the Southeast part of the United States. Smallest were in the West.
>
> (4) 37% of those reporting in the study, all Northeast, and all from the State of Washington have appointed boards. Elected boards were dominant in the West (Washington excluded) and in the Southwest.
>
> (5) Most preferred method?--whichever one they currently had.
>
> (6) Four highest categories of occupations of board members: Merchant 16%; Executive supervisor 15.5%; Finance, banking, insurance 11.5%; Attorney 10.0%.
>
> Comment: Public community college boards reporting in this study are dominated by members from the business and managerial occupations, to refute the often heard remark that they are dominated by medical doctors, farmers and lawyers.

Some shifts in these occupation clusters have occurred, apparently, since 1969. The most dramatic ones being the appearance of increasing numbers of people describing themselves as retired and the appearance of more females and minorities.

Recent studies of trustees allow comparisons with the 1969 work. A study by Pray for AACJC in 1975[5] is important as it raised unanswered questions. These were identified and researched further by Drake in 1977--perhaps the best single study on community college trustees yet published.[6] ACCT sponsored a study of its own member boards in 1976 by Grafe.[7] Though this study was useful, it was severely limited by the small number of returns and the virtual absence of private two-year college responses.

Some Things About Trustees

From the attention paid them by conferences and studies, there are a few things which can be said about trustees. What follows, unless otherwise qualified, combines the Drake and Grafe findings with my own 1969 study.

Generally speaking:

1. Race and Sex:

   There is greater minority representation than on degree granting boards (universities and four year colleges) and at least as many women. But trustees of community colleges are overwhelmingly male (over 80%) and white (over 90%).

   (a) The Grafe and Drake studies indicated between 5% and 7% of trustees are Black which compares with 1% reported by ETS for degree granting institutions.

   (b) The Drake study revealed substantially more women members on private community college boards (23%) than on public ones (15%).

   (c) The Drake study reported 2% Hispanic speaking trustees while this category was not used in other studies.

2. Religion:

   Overwhelmingly protestant--may be as high as 70%.

3. Age:

   Trustees are in their later middle ages. One study reported 43.5% as between 50 and 65. Another study reported 35% between 50 and 60. About 5% are over 70 and under 2% under 30.

4. Occupations:

   Trustees come from business, merchandizing, industrial and financial occupation areas. Though there are minor differences in the 1969, Grafe and Drake studies, there is substantial agreement on the point that by far the most trustees come from the commercial world.

   By far the better data, and most recent, was reported by Drake. Though she did not report her data exactly as presented below, it suggested the following groupings (for 5,440 trustees--3,523 on public boards and 1,917 on private boards):

Table 1

Occupations of Trustees

OCCUPATIONS	NUMBER OF PERSONS
A. Public Boards	
1. Executive-merchandizing, manufacturing	769
2. Executive-banking, insurance	315
3. Retired	321
4. Farmer/Rancher	282
5. Education	270
B. Private Boards	
1. Executive-merchandizing, manufacturing	337
2. Education	216
3. Clergy	214
4. Executive-banking, insurance	191
5. Retired	161

These differences, though not exactly the same, had been found between public and private boards in 1969. The great difference was, however, the appearance and strength of the "retired" category.

Other strongly represented occupations were housewife, lawyer, and medic--though none made the top five and not all were represented equally on the three studies.

5. Income:

Though there were twice as many private college trustees over $100,000 yearly income as public members (8% to 4%), private trustees on the whole do not have incomes higher than public trustees--46% of private trustees were reported earning under $25,000 as compared with but 38% of public college trustees.

Though the larger group of trustees in the public sector report incomes in the $25,000 to $50,000 category, this may change dramatically if retired persons continue to come on to the boards (this is not to suggest that retired persons have lower incomes).

6. Socio-geographic location of residence:

Almost evenly divided between urban, suburban and rural with a slight edge for those living in suburbs.

There is a need to study the place of residences of urban college trustees (i.e., do they live in the inner city?).

7. Education:

Well educated with about 75% having a bachelor or higher degree.

Some Things About Boards

It is now also possible to say some general things about boards as distinct from the individual trustees:

1. Size:

The more popular number of trustees on a board is seven (7). There is a strong tendency to use odd numbers of members--5, 7, 9, 11, etc.

Private boards are larger than public ones--18.9% private average to a 7.6% public average.

2. Method of selection:

There are two basic methods of selection: elected and appointed.

Election is usually from a local constituency. It is not clear how private colleges conduct the election--perhaps election is by other board members.

Appointment is by one of three methods: by local authority, by the governor, by a combination of local and state authority (usually also involving the governor).

The 1969 study reported 69% of boards as elected while the 1976 (Grafe) study reported 61% of them as elected. However, the 1977 (Drake) study used individual trustees rather than boards as the data base and reported 51% of trustees appointed and but 49% elected (does this mean that larger boards are more often appointed or that states with larger systems

have appointed boards?).

The 1969 study reported 80% of appointed boards involved the governor in some fashion. The 1977 study reported that for individual trustees the governor was apparently involved in only 34% of the appointments of individuals.

3. Functions: The board makes policy and should be evaluated.

The 1969 study reported boards clearly understand the distinction between policy making and administration. The 1977 study made this even more clear by noting 90% of presidents and 95% of public college chairpersons had made such a distinction.

As noted in Chapter Three, Konrad has made the case for board self-evaluation and Drake reported they are ready to consider this.

A graphic presentation of these "functions" would be:

Table 2

Board Functions

Response	Number of Responses	Percent
1. WHAT IS THE PRINCIPAL FUNCTION OF THE BOARD?		
A. Public colleges (104 responses)		
1. Set policy	69	66.3
2. Hire key personnel	11	10.5
3. Budget making	10	9.6
4. Community relations	8	7.6
B. Private Colleges (27 responses)		
1. Set policy	24	88.9
2. Raise funds	3	11.1
2. ON WHAT DOES THE BOARD SPEND MOST OF ITS TIME?		
A. Public colleges (101 responses)		
1. Finances and budget	34	33.6
2. Development plans	23	22.8
3. Plant and facilities	11	10.9
4. Curriculum	3	2.9
B. Private colleges (25 responses)		
1. Committee reports	10	40.0
2. Finances and budget	9	36.8
3. Campus development	5	20.0
3. ON WHAT SHOULD A BOARD SPEND MORE TIME?		
A. Public colleges (85 responses)		
1. Educational programs	21	24.7
2. Finances	14	16.4
3. Policy making	14	16.4
4. Planning	11	12.9
5. Faculty and students	7	8.2
B. Private colleges (19 responses)		
1. Finances	7	36.8
2. Planning	6	31.5
3. Policy making	4	21.1

Overall, the Drake report is highly recommended reading for new trustees, particularly in the area of functions.

Differences Between Elected and Appointed Members of Boards

A recent doctoral study by Thompson (1979) examined the characteristics and beliefs of community college board members. She found substantial differences between members on the basis of election or appointment.

She found that the typical appointed member was younger than elected members. She reported also that appointed members stood a greater chance of being liberal by political preference as compared with the more conservative elected members. Further:[8]

> Appointed board members favored more than elected board members restrictive entrance requirements, "low" rather than "no" tuition, remedial program funding as part of the regular budget, faculty and student involvement in policy developments, faculty freedom of expression on campus, direct employment by the board of only the college president, state financing with local control, and financing by the state legislature. Elected board members favored more than appointed board members "no" tuition, payment for board service, and local finance and control. . . .

This important study should be followed up by one dealing with the effectiveness of boards. Effectiveness could be a judgment reached by agreement among the boards themselves. Also important would be evaluations by the agencies with which they deal. Perhaps most importantly, some measure could be made of the degree to which the colleges they serve achieve the stated purposes of those colleges.

Perspectives, Satisfactions and Frustrations

Table 3

Sources of Greatest Pressure on Boards

Source	Number of Responses	Percent
A. Public colleges (81 responses)		
1. Securing financing	41	50.6
2. Faculty militancy and salary demands	12	14.8
3. Organized public pressure	11	13.6
4. Enrollment pressures	4	4.9
B. Private colleges (20 responses)		
1. Securing financing	18	85.7

All studies agree that the outstanding pressures on boards, public or private, stem from financial matters. This is closely related, of course, to faculty concerns as faculty are the most costly part of the operation. Though this is strong in the public sector, it will come as no surprise that financial pressures were reported as the near total preoccupation of private college boards.

Table 4

Sources of Future Problems and Pressures for Boards to Contend With

Source of Pressure	First Choice	Second Choice	Total Responses
A. Public colleges (81 responses)			
1. Financial pressures	34	22	56
2. Student unrest	18	30	48
3. Faculty militancy	26	16	42
B. Private colleges (23 responses)			
1. Financial pressures	17	3	20
2. Student unrest	2	9	11
3. Faculty militancy	3	4	7

Student pressures, activism and militancy (as separate from enrollment) were predicted by trustees early in the 1970s as future problems. This has not proven true. Also, it would appear that trustee concern over faculty militancy has shifted to a concern over negotiation and arbitration procedures. In short, though community colleges were never really very "hot" in terms of riots and protests, even in the late 1960s and early 1970s (when compared with universities), they appear, as with universities, to have "cooled down."

Individual statements were asked for in the 1969 study, and some of them remain interesting in 1982. Regarding frustrations, chairpersons reported these concerns:

Michigan: the attempt to maintain autonomy and deal with the state legislature;

Maryland: keeping a middle of the road policy posture between academic freedom and practical operation in an essentially rural setting;

Washington: gutless administrators and faculty;

Illinois:
1. My own shortcomings--need to make decisions on which I cannot be sure I'm right; and
2. Unwillingness of educators (both administrators and faculty) to consider financial problems realistically.

Chairpersons were finally asked a series of questions about what presidents do. First they were asked to recommend activities for a newly elected president.

Table 5

Recommended Activities for New Presidents

Responses	Number of Responses	Percent
1. After a new president is elected, what should he do first (between election and arrival on the job)?		
A. Public colleges (93 responses)		
1. Learn the background on college affairs and history.	47	50.5
2. Learn all possible about community	28	30.1
3. Study board policies and organization	7	7.5
B. Private colleges (17 responses)		
1. Learn the background on college affairs and history.	13	82.3
2. What is the first thing a new president should do upon arrival on the campus?		
A. Public colleges (97 responses)		
1. Meet with the total faculty	48	49.4
2. Meet student leaders	15	15.4
3. Meet with the board.	11	11.3
4. Make public appearances	6	6.1
5. Establish his "authority"	6	6.1
B. Private collegs (31 responses)		
1. Meet with the total faculty.	12	38.7
2. Meet with the student body	11	35.4
3. Establish his "authority".	4	12.9

Comment: These recommendations followed quite closely those made by presidents in 1966.[9] The new president was enjoined not to move too hastily, if this were possible, but to move immediately to get to know the college and community.

Chairpersons were next asked:

1. How can the president best help the board:
2. How can the board best help the president?

Answers to the first question were nearly unanimous that the president best helps the board by giving information--concisely, thoroughly and honestly.

The answer to the second question was also clear. First, the board best helps the president by supporting him and cooperating with him. The second recommendation from board chairmen as to how best to help the president was the board should

provide clear policy statements for the president to follow.

As might be expected, there was a wealth of comment around these two questions. Some of the more interesting ones were:

A. How can the president help the board?

North Carolina:	by keeping the board fully informed and by requesting help when it is needed.
New York:	by keeping the board aware of things--even before they happen!
Minnesota:	1. Providing a continued flow of information related to the college, state college board, and legislation related to junior colleges; 2. Charging the board with specific assignments in accordance with their designated responsibilities and then provide support. . .
Maine:	by not bringing trivia to the board as this is properly a function of administration.
Washington:	timely information. Anticipation of problems.
California:	supply facts. Introduce new ideas and especially introduce new people; i.e., consultants or advisers.

B. How can the board best help the president?

North Carolina:	not get involved in details of managing the affairs of the college. Stick to policy matters. Support the president when he is right. Tell him when he is wrong.
Arizona:	offer assistance--not pressure.
Washington:	remind him he has no tenure. See that he delegates authority.
California:	stand up to its convictions. Allow time for relaxed discussion. Order him to take a day off.
Kansas:	by understanding his problems and making policies he can stand on.

Effectiveness

Presidents earlier had been asked to rate the performance of their boards. Tabulated responses were:

Table 6

Level of Performance of Boards by Presidents

Rating	Number	Percent
A. Public colleges (167 responses)		
1. Excellent	88	52.7
2. Good	48	28.7
3. Average	21	12.5
4. Indifferent	4	2.4
5. Bad	6	3.4
B. Private colleges (39 responses)		
1. Excellent	13	33.3
2. Good	20	51.2
3. Average	5	12.8
4. Indifferent	1	2.6
5. Bad	0	0.0

Comment: All six boards rated "bad" were "advisory boards"--local college non-policy making boards in a state with a single state level board for all colleges. Three of the five rated "indifferent" were also such "advisory boards."

Effectiveness Compared

Most presidents gave good marks to their boards for performance. In 1969 a greater percentage of public college presidents rated their board's performance as excellent than did private college presidents--52.7 percent compared with 33.3 percent. These ratings improved by 1977 when both presidents and board chairs rated 60% of public boards in the highest category and 40% of the private boards equally high.

How best to help boards to continue to improve their performance? With 151 responses, public college presidents urged that boards improve themselves by becoming more informed or involved (43 percent); or through participating in inservice training programs or workshops (37 percent). Private college presidents urged the same thing with 67.7 percent urging boards to become more involved and 19.4 percent recommending inservice or workshop training. ACCT has sought avidly to serve as a focus for both these methods of improving board effectiveness.

Summary

Three quite recent studies allow comparisons to be made of some things known about trustees and boards. Not enough is known. In particular it might be helpful to determine: 1) why trustees decide to seek or accept trustee positions: 2) why boards perform (organize and vote) as they do; and 3) a comparative study of board effectiveness--why are some good and others not as measured by what happens to the community colleges they serve. A study of state level boards also needs to be conducted, as many authorities are fearful and yet some are supportive of the existence and functions of these separate governing bodies.

The heart of the issue remains. How is it possible to help board members become better? This clearly has been the highest priority for ACCT as measured by both what it has said and done. It is time now to look closely at the why and how of ACCT.

Footnotes to Chapter Four:

1. Johnson, B.: The Junior College Board of Trustees. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, University of California. February, 1971.

2. Hatfield, T.: "Expanding Perceptions of Junior College Board Members: A Report of a Workshop," The Junior College Board of Trustees. Ibid.

3. Morgan, D.: "The Junior College Board of Trustees and the President," The Junior College Board of Trustees. Ibid. p. 37.

4. For Community College Trustees. CCCB Newsletter. Washington, D.C. June, 1971, p. 2.

5. Pray, F.: A New Look at Community College Boards of Trustees and Presidents and Their Relationships: Suggestions for Change. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1976.

6. Drake, S.: Research Report: A Study of Community and Junior College Boards of Trustees. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1977.

7. Grafe, C.: The Trustee Profile of 1976. Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees. Undated.

8. Thompson, M. J.: A Study of Relationships Between Selected Characteristics of Elected and Appointed Community College Trustees and Their Beliefs About Selected Issues. (Abstract) Unpublished dissertation. Pullman, WA: Washington State University. 1979.

9. Morgan, D.: "So You've Arrived! Now What Do You Do?" The Two Year College President. Chapter One. Moses Lake, Washington: Big Bend Community College. Mimeographed.

PART THREE:

GETTING IT TOGETHER

Chapter Five: Search for a Home
Chapter Six: Independence and Transition: 1972-75
Chapter Seven: The Approach to Maturity

CHAPTER FIVE

Search for a Home

Common interests do make for common bonds. In the case of community college trustees and the colleges they serve, newness and the need to understand and be understood is common, and a certain sense of urgency is easily visible. This seems to have always been true for people involved in community college work. For example, in 1920 some community college representatives met in St. Louis to found the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC, since renamed the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges--AACJC), and Brick described one of their chief motivations as:[1]

> . . . a small group of administrators came together to defend the junior college. Senior colleges, for the most part bound by traditional thinking, viewed the junior college of the 1920's with attitudes ranging from skepticism to virtual contempt. One of the major concerns of the Association (AAJC) was to win acceptance of junior colleges by other educational institutions.

Acceptance of community colleges is not yet universal (see Chapter Two). For example, it seems sometimes that the only change of thinking in university circles since 1920 has been increased skepticism or in some instances the growth of outright hostility.[2] What has changed in the intervening 60 years since the 1920s is that community colleges care less what universities think.

As the community college movement matured from 1900 to 1960s, there developed other more pressing reasons for trustees within these institutions to want to organize a national association other than just the skepticism of universities. Meardy gave a paper at the national conference on trustees held at the University of California at Los Angeles in 1970. He focused on a different need for trustees to organize--to keep from being overwhelmed by other associations, particularly faculty ones:[3]

> First of all, local efforts at image building and the securing of sound financing must be continued and strengthened.
>
> Secondly, affiliating with associations represented here at this conference and within your own state is a necessity.
>
> If we are to have a strong voice at any table, if we are to be heard in Washington, or if we are to flex any kind of political muscle. we must organize!
>
> Consider the following statement made by a national association secretary. "In state after state higher education faculties are organizing as they never have, because they have learned that they can accomplish more, better, as a united body than they can as individuals. They are teaming up with state and national education associations for the needed additional strength in numbers, staff, resources and aid." Should we not organize for the same reasons?

Wilson, of the AACJC Central Staff, was also at this 1970 conference with

Meardy, and he also noted reasons for community college trustees to organize:[4]

> There are three major reasons why trustees should organize to work together regularly. Organized programs can help them do a better job of: (1) determining college mission statements, objectives, and functions; (2) providing needed resources; and (3) evaluating the operations of the college.

Trustees appeared fully aware of these things, but there was competition for their attention and interest. It has been documented in Chapter Four that a prime source of trustees is from the "hard headed" business world, and they might be excused during these early years by acting something like: "Yes, we hear you, but we are making up our minds!" In fact, they were indeed sorting out the options, on their own terms!

Keene, one of the pioneer trustees working to establish a national association as a home where trustees might meet with each other, has written:[5]

> The Association of Community College Trustees had its genesis in 1965. At that time, there were two national organizations in existence whose primary function was to serve trustees--The Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities (AGB) and the National School Boards Association.
>
> The image of AGB was that of a passive organization existing in the comfortable climate of the "golden age of higher education" when the prestige of higher education glowed, enrollments zoomed and fiscal support from public and private sources was strong. AGB did not actively seek the participation of community college trustees.

Perhaps the "skepticism" of community colleges evidenced by university-based people had rubbed off on their trustees. However, the other association Keene mentioned, the NSBA, was neither skeptical nor did it seem to feel it had laurels to rest on. It actively sought community college trustee involvement:[6]

> The National School Boards Association (NSBA) is one of the national associations with which board members are encouraged to affiliate. Within the association is a group called the Council of Community College Boards. NSBA is the one national association in the United States organized to represent the lay leadership in education--board members. The Council of Community College Boards then becomes their national voice, upon affiliation.

There was a third contender, the AACJC (though Keene did not list it!); and it was unmistakably interested in community college trustees. The AACJC had been actively encouraging presidents to bring trustees to the annual convention since the early 1960s. But it was not until the late 1960s that they encouraged the formation of a Council of Trustees as an affiliate of AACJC. Although the AACJC had seemed to many to be a natural base for trustees, it had moved slowly for unknown reasons. By 1970 the trustees within NSBA had strengthened their Council

(CCCB) and Wilson of AACJC was led to recognize at a national conference in 1970 that trustees had options other than to organize within the AACJC.[7]

> What kind of an organization should trustees form or what association should they join? The answer depends on what trustees are trying to achieve through organized efforts. The answer may be more than one association.
>
> So far as I know, there is no conflict between such organizations as American Association of Junior Colleges, Association of Governing Boards, and the National School Boards Association. Trustees as individuals and colleges as institutions should join associations that have goals and conduct activities that will help achieve the college objectives.
>
> The second step is for trustees to be certain the college objectives are understood and generally acceptable.
>
> The third step is to learn what the goals of existent associations are.
>
> The final step is to join associations with like goals and form additional organizations whenever it seems advisable.
>
> (However) the first step is to decide that trustees need to organize if they intend to fulfill their responsibilities and achieve the objectives of their colleges.

Wilson's last point, that it was necessary first to decide <u>if</u> trustees needed to organize is still germane. Not all community colleges have joined any association representing trustees. However, there were in 1965 growing numbers of them convinced that the NSBA and <u>not</u> the AACJC was the better rallying point.

The marked ambivalence on the part of the AACJC in accommodating the trustee search for a home is puzzling. It might well have stemmed from concerns that an association of trustees could be threatening to local college administrators. This possibility must be cast in terms of a select aspect of the development of AACJC--it was community college administrators and specialists who brought that association into being and which dominated it. In particular, presidents came to dominate the AACJC, and serving these presidents became the "primary function" of AACJC. As a onetime college president himself, the writer can understand why chief administrators have a compelling interest in knowing where their trustees are and what they might be up to. An association of them could be of possible concern and would have to be watched. Indeed there are now increasing numbers of presidents traveling with their trustees to the ACCT annual convention, and many presidents are concerned about their "role" in trustee affairs.

Another possible explanation of AACJC's failure to attract and hold the interest of trustees was that by 1970 the AACJC was deep in processes of reorganization. A major change had to do with the make-up of the AACJC board and the kinds of groups which might have input into it.

The AACJC board previously had been made up almost exclusively of presidents. Now special interest groups (e.g., professors in universities, various minority

groups, and trustees) were encouraged to form Councils. These Councils would exist in a satellite relationship with the AACJC board, but they had only the potential of membership on that board.[8] Perhaps it was the "satellite" arrangement which could be viewed as restricting trustees to a peripheral role, that led trustees to concentrate elsewhere where their concerns would be central.

However, before anything lasting could be put into motion, the recurring problem of staffing the effort would have to be worked on. By 1970, somewhat belatedly in the opinion of some, NSBA finally committed professional staff and support to the Community College trustees' Council (CCCB). With this support the CCCB of NSBA gained an immediate advantage. It became more attractive to the trustees simply because it had gotten some tangible support.

NSBA: Home or Shelter

Though looked at first as a home for community college trustees, events since have led the trustees away from this first shelter within NSBA. The history of this needs to be established. As stated earlier, the interest of NSBA in community college trustees and of those trustees in NSBA had begun in the early 1960s By 1965, NSBA was willing to consider formalizing these interests. Keene, writing of the 1965 efforts, described the NSBA from the view of a trustee:[9]

> NSBA was an evolving organization, having a few years previously separated itself from the protective wing of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) . . . . Recognizing the potential benefits which could mutually accrue to its organization and to community college trustees, NSBA initiated action to explore the possibilities for creating an organization for community college trustees under its aegis.

In September of 1965, the NSBA's director of Special Services, Freeman Vaughan organized a study meeting of a very small group of community college trustees. It was held in Chicago and was attended by Jeanne Goddard of Ormond Beach, Florida; Roy Jones of Hillside, Illinois; and J. Stuart Doyle of Chicago. Goddard has written of this meeting:[10]

> Freeman Vaughan called--(I was) the first trustee called. He called me because I was the liaison committee chairman of the Florida School Board Association to the Advisory Committee of the Junior Colleges in Florida. Then the colleges were under (K-12) school boards . . . Roy Jones and Stu Doyle were in or near Chicago at that time. We had one evening of brainstorming and nothing conclusive was decided except to do some thinking and talking back home and meet again in a few months.

One result of this 1965 Chicago meeting was the NSBA would schedule in April 1966 (in Minneapolis) two special workshop sessions for community college trustees

this would be at the same time as the NSBA annual convention. Goddard chaired one of these NSBA workshops:[11]

> We decided to have a learning workshop, which Freeman (Vaughan) put together--a student, a president, and a trustee. (We) discussed the concept and philosophy of the community college. . . .
>
> There was an evening session for trustees to discuss and get reactions to the possibility of a Community College Trustee Council being created under NSBA. . . .
>
> The most enthusiastic group of trustees was from DeKalb Junior College (Georgia). George Fellows was spokesman. That group promised 100% cooperation and were ready to go Now! (emphasis in original)

Following the workshops in Minneapolis, Goddard reported to NSBA that there was a sentiment favorable to organizing community college trustees within the NSBA. Keene, in his description of NSBA, noted there were some problems facing that Association:[12]

> . . . faced at that time with monumental tasks in carrying out the priorities established by its Delegate Assembly in charting new courses to deal with federal aid to education, desegregation, civil rights, collective bargaining, and other current issues and problems, NSBA could not readily expend the professional staff time needed to organize a council of community college boards.

The result was that no major efforts were mounted by NSBA to accommodate the community college trustees for almost a year. Goddard, however, kept things moving and traveled from Florida to Chicago twice during that year to try to spur NSBA to action. She was successful in that NSBA scheduled two workshops and a "bull session" for community college trustees at the 1967 Portland annual NSBA convention.

The trustee sessions at the Portland NSBA convention in 1967 were heavily attended by representatives from colleges in Washington, Oregon, and California. It called the attention of the West to both the NSBA and efforts of trustees to organize, and the two year college movement had long been vigorous on the West Coast. A direct result of the 1967 meeting was that greater national visibility was added to what had been essentially a Midwest and Florida trustee effort up to that time. A strengthened and wider-based consensus emerged that a national organization for trustees would be most helpful and welcomed.

It was resolved at the Portland convention that Goddard be instructed to serve as spokesperson for the trustees who met there. Goddard then asked that NSBA proceed "without delay in organizing a council of community college boards."[13] NSBA responded by asking for a meeting in Chicago in August 1967.

Paul Wolfe (Iowa), Warren Smith (Wyoming), Ruth Shepherd (Washington State),

James Bland (Maryland) and Worth Keene (California) met with Goddard in August in Chicago. Also meeting with these trustees were NSBA president Ruth Mancuso and executive director Harold Webb.

The result was an Interim Steering Committee. The NSBA president, Mancuso, appointed Goddard to chair the committee and asked Wolfe to serve as secretary. Guidelines for operations were established. At last things were moving within the NSBA on a formal level. Goddard noted:[14]

> After that meeting (Chicago), I attended all the meetings of the Board of Directors of NSBA. In February 1968, I spent two days in Washington, D.C., as a member of the Rules and Resolutions Committee. At this work session I had an opportunity to really have input for postsecondary education --mostly community colleges. (Many of the Board of Directors did not have community colleges in their school systems--of course California was strong.)

The Trustee Council Formalized and Activated

Following the Chicago meeting and before the 1968 NSBA annual convention set for Detroit in April, the NSBA president presented that association's executive board with a recommendation that a council of community college boards (CCCB) be formed within NSBA. That recommendation was presented as an action item. It was approved.

Plans to stimulate interest in the Council-to-be were made. The first effort was to focus on the NSBA Detroit convention. It was poor timing. There was neither time nor staffing enough to be effective.

Little staff effort could be spared the fledgling CCCB by the parent NSBA. However, at the continued pressing of Goddard, a secretary was appointed by NSBA. J. Stuart Doyle (trustee of the Chicago City Colleges and present at the first NSBA meeting called in 1965) agreed to serve. He began in May 1968.

Doyle's immediate tasks were those facing the secretary of any new association--amplify visibility, expand membership and move the Council towards a self-sustaining base. His first efforts within NSBA and with the pioneers of CCCB led to a three day "national conference" for community college trustees. It was held near O'Hare Field in Chicago, September 13-15, 1968. It was a great success--186 registrants came from 28 states.

Goddard has written ecstatically regarding that first "national conference" --it must be remembered the many frustrations she had encountered in the past three years:[15]

> The meeting in Chicago in September 1968 was a thundering success. Trustees argued pro and con of being under NSBA umbrella. However, majority ruled--Council became a viable

one. I was elected chairman, Worth (Keene) vice chairman, Paul Wolfe, secretary. (emphasis in the original)

Keene also has written regarding that first conference:[16]

> The (Chicago) conference also enabled the Interim Steering Committee (appointed by NSBA to get the CCC going) to hold two meetings to refine the organizational structure, adopt a tentative dues schedule and plan special programming for community college trustees at the April 1969 annual convention of NSBA in Miami . . . Robert Leonard agreed to revise in final form the proposed By-Laws for adoption at the convention.

Though obvious gains had been made since 1965 to organize within the NSBA, the matter of staff support continued to plague community college trustees and the new CCCB. However, the organization was becoming more visible, and interest in it could be found across the nation.

Between the well-publicized "national conference" in Chicago and the April, 1969, NSBA Annual Convention in Miami, thirty-three additional community college boards from seventeen states joined CCCB, and they were present at Miami to vote. Based on the earlier success, a second "national conference" was set for September of 1969, again in Chicago. But in June of 1969 Doyle resigned the secretaryship.

The time remaining between Doyle's resignation and the scheduled Chicago conference did not allow for adequate publicity. Response from trustees across the country was too light, and the conference was cancelled. The need for staff became more pressing.

Meanwhile, about this time, interest in trustee organization quickened within the AACJC central staff in Washington, D.C. Goddard wrote:[17]

> About this time (1969) AACJC invited me and trustees who had not been involved with NSBA. There were six of them, from around the country, to plan a session for trustees at the next AACJC convention (Atlanta). . . . It became obvious then that AACJC had some concern over NSBA trustees council.
>
> The planning of this committee did not take any position at all of forming a council under AACJC--it was strictly a workshop sort of deal. However, it later developed that some trustees expressed concern regarding our organization--but only discussion.

Meanwhile, staffing of CCCB had apparently continued as a low priority for NSBA. It was not until June of 1970 that William Meardy was selected by NSBA and assigned as secretary for the CCCB. Meardy had been a community college administrator in California. The hiring of Meardy as full-time director followed strong trustee attendance at the NSBA convention at San Francisco in April, 1970. CCCB officers elected at San Francisco were: Worth Keene (California), Chair; Dale Ensign (Wyoming), First Vice-Chair; Frank Gallagher (Michigan), Second Vice-Chair.

Meardy officially went to work for CCCB on July 1, 1970. He was officed in

Evanston, Illinois, at the main NSBA offices. He picked up immediately on the stronger trustee base established in April at San Francisco and on the success of the 1968 Chicago national conference. Keene has written:[18]

> A very successful two-day convention for trustees was held in Chicago in October 1970 with the theme, "The Community College - A National Trust." This was followed in February 1971 with an equally successful seminar and workshop program in New Orleans having the theme, "Tools of Boardsmanship - Updating, New Training and Retraining." When the Council met for its programs and regular annual business meeting at the NSBA conference in April 1971 in Philadelphia, it had a membership of 113 colleges.

After Meardy's arrival at CCCB on July 1, 1970, he also picked up immediately on communication needs. An occasional newsletter for CCCB had been published by NSBA. The first available copy is dated March 24, 1970, and it detailed plans for the 1970 CCCB meeting in San Francisco. The next copy was dated June 10, 1970. It gave the results of the San Francisco meeting, Meardy's appointment, listed new colleges joining CCCB, and announced the fall convention in Chicago set for October 1-3, 1970.

The success that Keene ascribed to the 1970 Chicago convention might have resulted from the sense of urgency and the topics conveyed by Meardy in the August, 1970 newsletter:[19]

> . . .the Chicago meeting is designed for YOU! College presidents and administrators and visitors are welcome, but the spotlight will be on the policy makers themselves, the BOARD. Tentative workshop titles are as follows:
>
> 1. "Defining Areas of National Concern for Community College Trustees"
> 2. "The Legal Rights of Students"
> 3. "Board Members Increasing Responsibility in Community College Governance"
> 4. "The Community College Trustee - A Nonpolitical Role in a Political Environment"
> 5. "Student Involvement in the Decision Making Process"

It was not surprising that the newsletter should take on this activist and urgent tone. Meardy did not want this series of workshops to suffer the same fate they had the previous year when they were cancelled. His own thinking had been revealed slightly earlier that year when he concluded a paper given at U.C.L.A. by declaring:[20]

> Separately trustees represent a political muscle totally devoid of any life or organized influence. Collectively, through the Council of Community College Boards, you might take on the form of a meaningful political giant. So, why not unify? Why not organize? The potential of what could be accomplished if the nation's community college boards of trustees organize remains unlimited.

Under the urging of Meardy there was an immediate push of CCCB towards a concern about and involvement in political processes and legislative matters. Trustees were encouraged by "The George Rodda Plan" to identify those from among themselves who had personal friends or contacts on the (federal) Senate and House Education Committees. "Who knows what benefits might accrue through a 'non-political' involvement in the political processes."[21] And again, the November 1970 newsletter stated that trustees were encouraged to act on the political scene: "As a trustee, do you make concerted efforts to visit with your congressman or senator when he is in town? If you do not--will you? We work in a political environment. Let's get politically involved."

The November, 1970, newsletter also established the dominant theme for CCCB that trustees should help to orient or train new trustees and that CCCB could and should facilitate this. Under the lead article on, "Council of Community College Boards - To Train New Community College Trustees"[22] a seminar was announced and scheduled for New Orleans on February 4-6, 1971. This seminar was designed for "new trustees of 12 months experience or less." It was stressed that CCCB planned to become a leading specialist in the training of trustees. The seminar enjoyed a high registration and was regarded as successful.

The CCCB met on the occasion of the NSBA Convention held in Philadelphia April 2-3, 1971. The theme for the part of the program devoted to trustees was, "Community College - Education for Living! Spotlight on Vocational Technical Education." Dale Ensign was elected to the CCCB chair and immediately struck an international note:[23]

> As far as we are concerned, international boundaries do not exist in the family of community college trustees. Our similarities so far exceed our differences that entering into a meaningful dialogue with our neighbors to the North could result in a profitable exchange of ideas. Canadian community college trustees are not only welcome to attend, but they and their colleges are encouraged to affiliate with the Council.

As could be predicted, Canadian trustees have, to date, shown more interest in their own Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC), but several Canadian institutions have formally joined the ACCT. Canadians might yet follow the path of their counterparts in the United States and establish their own trustee association, and they may yet be attracted in greater numbers to the ACCT as its "primary function" is clearly in serving trustees first.

The Impact of Staff

Trustees are not professionals in the sense that they are rarely paid to do

that work to the exclusion of other activities. Though many had been generous through the years with their time and personal resources, there had been an obvious limit to what they could commit. It should be remembered that the CCCB was delayed for an entire year because inadequate staffing had been committed to the Detroit NSBA Convention in 1968 when a push to organize CCCB was to have occurred. It was not until 1969 that the pieces could be picked up again. Also, when Doyle resigned as secretary to CCCB in June of 1969, the scheduled workshops set for the following September in Chicago had to be cancelled.

The vigor, enthusiasm and commitment of the trustees required a staff base. The importance of this was underscored when Meardy came on duty in July of 1970. The tempo of things immediately picked up, and the Chicago convention in the Fall was scheduled and held successfully.

The flurry of activities that characterized late 1970 and all of 1971 could be attributed to the fact that there was someone devoting full time to the affairs of CCCB. It was not always evident, however, such attention paid community college trustees had the full backing of financial support from the NSBA. NSBA itself was a relatively new Association and had its principal focus on the K-12 common school district board members.

The advantage of central staff was underscored again in the late summer of 1971 when President Nixon imposed ceilings on prices, rents, wages and salaries. This was announced on August 15, 1971. In two days the CCCB central staff had an "extra" of the newsletter in the mails which gave details and information about this event as it might effect boards still negotiating with faculties. It was also an indication of the awareness of political realities as these relate to the field. It may well also have lent added strength to the conviction that the trustees ought to have a Washington, D.C. based operation (remember that NSBA was located in Evanston, Illinois).

First Steps Away from NSBA

The second national convention was scheduled for Denver in the early fall of 1971. This fall meeting was without reference to the NSBA Convention, and it was set up and conducted solely by the CCCB.

At this Denver meeting, spring seminars were planned and set for Columbus, Ohio, and Dallas for early 1972, again without reference to the parent NSBA calendar. These spring seminars have since become a trademark of the ACCT operations, and they are an expansion of the first trustee training seminar held in New Orleans.

Meeting by themselves (away from NSBA) so successfully in 1971 might have finalized thinking that trustees should and could move away from NSBA officially.

The possibility and desirability of this had been a recurring matter of debate among trustees since 1968. At any rate, in March, 1972, an emergency meeting of the CCCB steering committee was convened in Kansas City. The subject revolved around the dissolution of the CCCB and the creation of an independent and wholly new association just for community college trustees!

Separation from NSBA - Birth of ACCT

From explorations begun in 1965, to the formal recognition of a desire of trustees to organize as the CCCB within NSBA in August of 1967 and continuing through the NSBA conventions when this finally came into being officially, trustees had openly debated the pros and cons of affiliation with the NSBA. Community college trustees were not the prime focus of NSBA. There had been the constantly nagging matter of early failure to provide staff and then later of minimal support given staff. At any rate, the March, 1972, emergency meeting resulted in a 13-1 vote that the CCCB Senate be encouraged, at the 1972 CCCB/NSBA Convention set for San Francisco in April, to endorse a recommendation to bring about an amiable separation from NSBA. The intent was to go it alone--to create an association of, and for, community college trustess.

Summary

There were stirrings in the early 1960s of an interest by community college trustees to seek affiliation with a national association representing trustees or boards. The two most interested national associations available were the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the National School Board Association.

Events led trustees to choose an early affiliation within the National School Boards Association. This continued for the five year period from 1967-1972, as trustees formally organized as the Council of Community College Boards within the NSBA.

By 1972 the recurring trustee urge to go it alone gained ascendancy within the CCCB, and they voted to dissolve their NSBA relationship and move to create a new association for, and operated by, community college trustees. The new association was christened the Association of Community College Trustees. It came into being on April 15, 1972, and faced a host of immediate and pressing problems.

For the trustees to have had the audacity to think they could do this must be attributed, as it has been, to an act of faith in themselves. That faith has proven well-founded in retrospect. At the time, there was a lot of work to be done--immediately.

Footnotes to Chapter Five:

1. Brick, M.: Forum and Focus of the Junior College Movement: The American Association of Junior Colleges. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University. 1964. p. 66.

2. MacLaren, S.: Community College - University Relations: An Examination of the Positive Functions of Conflict. Occasional Paper No. 1. Stillwater, Oklahoma and Washington, D.C.: Oklahoma State University and Council of Universities and Colleges of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1978. p. 8.

3. Meardy, W.: "Junior College Trustees: Organizing for Work Together I," The Junior College Board of Trustees. Occasional Paper No. 16. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, University of California. February, 1971. p. 60.

4. Wilson, R.: "Junior College Trustees: Organizing for Work Together II," The Junior College Board of Trustees. Ibid. p. 64.

5. Keene, W.: "Early History of ACCT: September 1965 - April 1971." Mimeographed. Updated. From ACCT files, Washington, D.C. Eight pages.

6. Meardy. Ibid.

7. Wilson, Ibid.

8. Meek, D. and Morgan, D.: Council of Universities and Colleges - An Introductory History. Tucson: Higher Education Program, University of Arizona. February, 1977. p. 11.

9. Keene. Ibid.

10. Goddard, J.: "Personal Notes to Supplement the History of Keene." Notes to W. Meardy of ACCT. Undated. From ACCT files, Washington, D.C.

11. Goddard. Ibid.

12. Keene. Ibid.

13. Goddard. Ibid.

14. Goddard. Ibid.

15. Goddard. Ibid.

16. Keene. Ibid.

17. Goddard. Ibid.

18. Keene. Ibid.

19. For Community College Trustees: CCCB Newsletter. Washington, D.C. August, 1980.

20. Meardy. Ibid.

Footnotes to Chapter Five (continued)

21. For Community College Trustees: CCCB Newsletter. Washington, D.C. November, 1970.

22. For Community College Trustees: November, 1970. Ibid.

23. Ensign, D.: "President's Remarks," For Community College Trustees: CCCB Newsletter. Washington, D.C. July, 1971.

CHAPTER SIX

Independence and Transition: 1972-75

The Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) came into being April 15, 1972, in San Francisco. By a vote of 42-1, the Senate of the disappearing Council of Community College Boards (CCCB) voted to disaffiliate with the National School Boards Association (NSBA) and strike out on their own.

Trustees across the country were increasingly aware of the need for an association to represent their special interests. They also appeared to be strongly interested in supporting the formation of their own special representative body. However, there was no guarantee that the new ACCT would succeed. The NSBA had underwritten the necessary costs of initial organization and promotion of their trustee Council, but now the new ACCT would have to pick up all costs of operation.

Why Independence?

The NSBA Board of Directors was on record indicating the move of community college trustees to an independent association was a mistake. They did, however, also go on record noting they understood some of the problems involved and, more importantly, that they had no plans to continue a trustee council with a community college focus if the CCCB moved out from the NSBA.

The new ACCT attempted to soothe what unhappiness existed in NSBA with two moves. First, it recommended that someone from the NSBA Board be invited to sit with the new ACCT Board from time to time. Second, it noted that some reimbursement to NSBA for some of the past costs the trustee council had incurred was clearly in order and would be addressed as quickly as possible (this was cleared up by 1974).

This concern for the sensitivities of NSBA had an unexpected payoff. For six weeks, from April 15 to May 31, 1972, the new ACCT executive director, Meardy, was allowed: (1) to maintain his old CCCB/NSBA office; (2) to keep his secretary; and (3) to retain auxillary services and salary! All of this was NSBA's contribution to the new ACCT.

Behind the move away from NSBA was the historic fact that not all community college trustees had wanted that organization as a home. The subject of why go with NSBA at all had been brought up in trustee seminars held in Chicago in 1968, and the question had recurred regularly. Over the nearly five years of official and unofficial recognition by the NSBA, the key complaints had been the lack of adequate staffing and that community colleges were not the primary focus of the

NSBA.

By March, 1972, the advantages of separation from NSBA had been considered at an emergency meeting, and by April these were stated as being:[1]

a. Association would have its own name;
b. Association would be responsible for its own direction;
c. Association would be responsible for its own policies;
d. Association could expect to have more voice in Congress if office is moved to Washington, D.C.;
e. Association would be responsible for its own finances;
f. Association would hopefully gain more services for trustees; and
g. Association would have more local control of the Association itself.

At the time these seemed compelling reasons for a move to independence from NSBA. However, looking behind these statements, it seems appropriate to once more assert that trustees and directors of educational institutions at all levels have continued to display a powerful urge to move away from associations dominated by professional educators as well as those created to serve other types of institutions. There was the expression of conviction in this case that not only are community colleges substantially different from other educational institutions, but so are the trustees serving these colleges different and need specific services.

Immediate Problems - Finances and Competition

The fact also was that the new ACCT was penniless! The first move of the new Board of Directors was for members to make pledges of personal resources to undergird an initial budget. Within hours after the vote, four trustees presented checks to the the new secretary-treasurer of ACCT which totaled $800.00. Bill Meardy's parents also stepped forward and made a personal loan of $1,400.00 to the Association to get things in gear.

There was also the matter of competition. There existed an organization of community college trustees located outside the confines of ACCT. This was the Council of Trustees of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJCB). Fortunately, the competition never reached emotional levels, and the two groups of trustees--the old CCCB and AACJCB--had been in touch. Indeed, Jeanne Goddard, who played such a central role in early attempts of trustees to find a home and had played such a leading role in bringing CCCB into existence, was on the AACJCB Board of Directors and, hence, belonged to both groups.

Survival of the new ACCT depended, then, on working out solutions to two pressing problems:

(1) How can a single association of trustees be formed from two

existing groups, lest there be divided support?

(2) How can a larger membership be attracted which could better deal with the financial demands almost certain to rise in connection with the founding a wholly new association?

The efforts to work out solutions to these basic problems can properly be referred to as the second pioneering period for community college trustees; the first pioneering effort had occurred from 1965 to 1968 when the trustees searched for nearly any kind of shelter which might prove to be a home.

From Pioneering Once Again to Settling In: 1972

There is a significant difference in the meaning between the words "pioneer" and "settler " in North America. The one explores and the other consolidates. There is usually a greater mystique attached to the word pioneer--evoking images of those who faced uncharted areas and unpredictable experiences. So it will be with the pioneers of the old CCCB who struggled between 1965-68 in search of support. However, the pioneer mystique is likely to be shared with those trustees who in 1971-72 set themselves adrift once more. This time, however, it was in their own boat rather than in one belonging to some other group.

A letter from Bill Meardy on November 23, 1982, recalled the first days of this second pioneering period. First, he noted he and his wife moved ACCT into their apartment when the generous grace period with NSBA ended May 31, 1972 (there were still two months left before moving to Washington, D.C. from Illinois). As noted in the Prologue to this book, the Meardy's moved the living room furniture to one-half of the room, set up a card table for the rented typewriter and rented a post office box. Bill then went on to write:

> The post office box was located less than 200 yards from the front door. Joyce and I used to flip a coin to see who would get the privilege of excitement as we opened door 472 to see if that trustee support was really there. And it was.
>
> Not only did member colleges reaffilitate early, but over 200 new members joined the organization during that time. With our business overhead low and with the great response from trustees, we did not need to touch my parents' loan.

As in any pioneering period, there have been mortalities along the way, some unrecorded. Also, there have been heroic deeds performed and hard struggles won--also many of them unrecorded. Attempts at histories result as often as not in omission of events as much as committing them to record. Many trustees who worked long and hard for the success of the early, and present, community college trustee organizations (if only with the local board to get it to commit to CCCB or ACCT) will go unmentioned here. This is a pity and regretted. It also seems

inevitable.

There is also the matter that frontiers change in nature--maybe they are only mental states in any case. There is, however, the hard fact that ACCT exists. It cannot be invented or gotten up again. A recognizable frontier has been passed. However, the greater frontiers to be faced will be those of perpetuation and keeping things at levels reasonably close to the expectations and realities of its membership. The leadership seems anchored in the ability to recognize possibilities--in continuing imagination--and ACCT seems to be constantly blessed with renewed imagination and vigor.

There was the matter of pre-packaging community colleges for sale to developing or other interested countries (this has been alluded to before in the Preface). Proposed by the Executive Director and endorsed by the Board of Directors, contact was made in 1974 with over 45 foreign embassies. No sales were reported, but positive responses were received.[2] The point here is, of course, that the idea was ingenious and imaginative.

Governance Structure for the New ACCT

The president (chairperson) of the CCCB had been Jeanne Goddard, 1968-1970; Worth Keene, 1970-1971; and Dale Ensign, 1971-72. All were still active and instrumental during the move to independence and the transition period which followed. Supervising the staff work was William Meardy. (See Appendix A for a listing of all trustee officers from 1965 to 1968.)

There were four critical areas which needed immediate attention: (1) establish a financial base and a budget; (2) retain present members and recruit new ones; (3) increase communication channels; and (4) make the physical move to Washington D.C. There was additionally, however, the nearly overwhelming need to try to pull together the two existing trustee organizations--the new ACCT and the trustee council within the AACJC organization.

Work began on all these fronts immediately. Results were soon evident at the 1972 Atlanta ACCT Convention.

The 1972 Atlanta Convention

The numbering of ACCT conventions needs explanation. ACCT has not been in existance long enough to justify the high numbers presently used. The first "official" one is regarded as having occurred in Chicago in 1970. But it should be remembered this was two years before ACCT was born! It was the fledgling CCCB that met in Chicago in 1970. It is correct to speak of it as the "first," if this is done from the perspective that it was the first time trustees had held a

true national convention of their own under any name.

Adding a bit to the confusion is the tendency of some documents to refer to a meeting of trustees in Chicago in September of 1968 as a national convention. This was not a meeting of a membership as such but one to determine the extent of trustee interest in a formal association with the NSBA. That 1968 meeting was the result of having been endorsed by NSBA late in 1967 and then being formally recognized by the NSBA as a subunit of itself in April of 1968. The 1968 fall meeting in Chicago came out of a need to explore trustee commitment and interest, but it was not a national convention.

At any rate, the 1971 Denver NSBA Convention which included meetings of the CCCB is called the second annual convention, and the 1972 convention in Atlanta is referred to as the third. Two further explanations are needed.

The 1972 convention was actually the first for the new ACCT. Also it ignored that the "third" had taken place already in April of 1972 in San Francisco, again in conjunction with the NSBA. However, as the San Fransicso meeting was for the purpose of dissolution from NSBA, the practice developed to ignore it in the numbering process and to regard the fall 1972 meeting which followed dissolution as the third.

However numbered, the 1972 ACCT Convention in Atlanta was a most important one. The fledgling ACCT was about to try to fly by itself.

The major outcome at Atlanta was the merger with the AACJC trustee group. This brings up the matter of guests. First, there was Mrs. Jimmy Carter, then wife of the Governor of Georgia, who welcomed the convention to Atlanta. Second, there was Mrs. Jean Ross, president of the AACJCB Board of Directors. Mrs. Ross had brought along the entire Board of her Council. Accompanying them was Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., and Richard Wilson--the president and vice president of AACJC Central Staff. This was the first time the boards of each of the trustee associations had met together. All agreed that two trustee organizations would only dilute the efforts of each and that a merger was in order.

Assimilation of AACJC's Council of Trustees (AACMCB) into ACCT

The results of the merger negotiations was a confederation and a merger. The confederation was between ACCT and AACJC. The merger was that the AACJC's Council of Trustees (AACJCB) were absorbed by ACCT. The merger was accomplished by reducing the immediate ACCT Board membership from 21 to 15 and then adding to it the nine AACJCB Board members. The confederation of ACCT and AACJC was an agreement in principle around the concept of "working together as equals," as proposed by Wilson--this was to focus at first on the utilization of the legislative office

of AACJC (headed by Frank Mansal) by the new ACCT with that office jointly representing both organizations.

Negotiations on these matters had begun on September 14, 1972, in Washington D.C., just prior to the Atlanta Convention of ACCT. They had resulted in a letter of understanding. Following the negotiations in Atlanta, this letter was presented to the new ACCT senate for action in October. The effective date of the merger was to be not later than November 15, 1972. Specifically, the letter of agreement stated:[3]

A. The newly elected Board of Directors of ACCT will be honored by the AACJCB Board.
B. The ACCT Board of Directors will be reduced from 21 to 15 members, and the present nine-member board of the AACJCB will merge with the new 15-member ACCT Board.
C. There will be an exchange board member (one each) between ACCT and AACJC.
D. ACCT will contract for legislative services from AACJC and be represented on the AACJC Legislative Commission.
E. All dues paid to the AACJCB will flow to ACCT.
F. Present members of AACJCB, or those committed to joining, will automatically become members of ACCT at the AACJCB affiliation fee of $100. Up to 150 members will be accepted. Deadline date was February 24, 1973.
G. Changes in officers or the name of the association or any similar changes may be made after the November 15, 1972, merger of the combined boards.
H. The grant applied for by the AACJCB from the Danforth Foundation in the amount of $72,000 will follow the organization in to the merger. (Grant never materialized.)
I. Private colleges to become eligible for membership in ACCT on the same basis as public colleges.

The ACCT senate voted on October 6 that the merger under these conditions be approved. There were, at this time, 194 member colleges of ACCT in the United States and two in Canada. The District of Columbia and 29 states were represented in the membership. This would all soon change as one of the major impediments to growth had been removed--there was now but one national association representing community college boards and trustees.

1972 had proved to be quite a year for the new ACCT!

Transition and Signs of Success: 1973-75

Nineteen seventy-three seemed a year when all that had been accomplished in 1972 had to be consolidated. It was a time for settling in again. In truth, it had been a very big bite for the new Association to take, and some time for chewin swallowing and digesting was clearly in order.

The 1973 Annual Convention was held in New Orleans in early November. It was chaired by President Frank Gallagher of Michigan. The Constitution adopted in

Atlanta in 1972 was refined. Three-member nominating committees for each of the five regions of ACCT were established for the purpose of recommending candidates for election to the Board of Directors. Close attention was paid to one resolution which addressed concern over present accrediting processes applied to community colleges.

This 1973 Convention also saw the first "harvest" of having become independent and from having accomplished the merger with AACJCB: 866 persons attended the New Orleans meeting. This must be compared with what had been regarded as the highly successful attendance of approximately 600 at Atlanta the previous year.[4]

The 1974 ACCT Convention at Portland would set the stage for another surge of activities. Held in late September, the big news at Portland was the ACCT was not only now fiscally self sufficient, but that it had repaid the NSBA $5,000 for past services. The concern about finances was not allayed totally, however, and the Association moved to a graduated fee schedule for the first time.

The fee schedule was predicted on ability to pay, and the assumption that the larger public institutions could, and should, pay more. Specifically, insitutional memberships were based on three premises:

(1) Institutions with enrollments of from 1-1,000 were to pay $200 per year. A graduated scale determined the assessment for larger institutions--up to $975 per year for institutions with over 35,000 students.
(2) Private colleges were to be charged the nimimum of $200 per year regardless of their size.
(3) Canadian colleges or institutes would also pay the minimum of $200 per year. Allowance was made for associate and lifetime memberships--these categories applying generally to individuals rather than institutions.[5]

The ACCT Newsletters

One evidence of the transition occurring within ACCT during this time comes from an analysis of the CCCB and ACCT newsletters. First published by CCCB under the title "For Community College Trustees," the newsletter was rechristened in 1972 at Atlanta as the Advisor. It was published more or less regularly after 1972, and it has since completed the change from an irregularly produced mimeographed publication to a polished tabloid style newspaper format complete with columns and columnists.

Interest here is in what these newsletters contained as measured by featured articles, and a highly arbitrary classification of them yielded the following table:

Table 7

Analysis of ACCT Newsletters

Topics Covered by Articles	Numbers of Featured Articles 1970-March 1972	March 72-1974
1. Legislative - Political Concerns	22	28
2. Organizational Info (about ACCT)	22	91
3. Trustee Development, e.g., Seminars	9	20
4. College Development, e.g., Programs	8	29
5. General Info, e.g., Legal, Faculty Problems	10	23

It is not surprising that the newsletter moved away from the early focus on political, legislative and organization matters to a near fixation on organizational matters from 1972-1974. This critical period for the new Association required that the newsletter emphasize the purposes of the Association and what it hoped to become. It became highly desirable to give recognition to new institutional members, and the newsletter could do this easily. In this regard, it should be emphasized once again that the ACCT members remain very pragmatic--they are still largely from the business world and must be convinced that something of value is offered before it will be bought. They also appreciate recognition.

Table 7 also gives evidence of a very healthy shift regarding the professionalization of boards. This is seen in the move towards increased concern over college development matters. Also, there was marked increase in attention paid general information matters--legal problems, faculty pressures, accountability measures, etc.

No analysis of the newsletter was attempted for 1975 to 1982. The period from 1975-78 could be titled "Early Success Leading to Maturity," and it is treated within this context in the next chapter. Meanwhile the newsletter reflected this changing mood as it shifted to columns, invited columnists and gained a sophistication not seen earlier.

1974-75: Early Signs of Success

As ACCT moved from 1974 into 1975, there was another surge of activities. In 1974 there had been the plateau reached of financial stability, and it seemed to be a sign that more now could be attempted.

Spring seminars were set to be co-sponsored by ACCT and AACJC with the AMA (American Management Association). These were announced in Portland in 1974 and

conducted in the Spring of 1975. The three associations reported the cooperation between all had been most satisfactory.

Also for the first time, the regional chairpersons for ACCT, of whom there were still five, were given responsibility to organize and conduct regional trustee seminars. These regional chairpersons had, in the past, been assigned chief responsibility for marshalling membership interest and organizing the efforts or nominating committees.

ACCTion Consortium

By far the greater success during this period in terms of new ventures was the support given the ACCTion Program. This program is a separate legal entity from ACCT, but its genesis and its ties were rooted very closely to the ACCT.

The idea for it had come from the Office of Education and ACCT:[6]

> The idea for ACCTion started in the Spring of 1974. Marie Y. Martin, director of the Community College Unit, Office of Education, was one of the first to recognize the need for a project to improve and strengthen two-year colleges. She and William Meardy, Executive Director of the Assocication of Community College Trustees (ACCT) met with representatives from twenty two-year colleges to discuss some possible solutions. The idea of a national consortium resulted.

Subsequently, 1,200 two-year colleges and technical institutes were contacted regarding the idea. Some 175 responded as interested in the program.

A plan developed that called for a nationally based consortium making application for Title III funds through the Commissioner of Education's office. The application was mounted by 114 of the two-year schools. It was approved and funded at one million dollars. Operations began July 1, 1975, under the leadership of Michael Crawford, Education Director. The purpose of it:[7]

> . . .was to help colleges improve and strengthen community services, instruction, resource development or student development services through staff and organizational development.

To achieve this broad purpose, four ACCTion Centeres were activated. Each was staffed by a resident director: (1) Community Services ACCTion Center at Kirkwood Community College, Iowa; (2) Instructional ACCTion Center at Tri-County Technical College, South Carolina; (3) Resource Development ACCTion Center, Brevard Community College, Florida; and (4) Student Development Services ACCTion Center, Hesston College, Kansas. The plan was to have participating institutions assess where they were in these general development areas and make a statement of where they would like to be some twelve months later. The Centers would assist the institutions in bridging the gap.

One of the underlying hopes of the entire ACCTion approach was that a "ripple effect" would occur. Said another way, it was hoped that the pioneering institutions would have a subsequent effect on nearby institutions which were not participating in the program. By the end of 1975, ACCTion could report measurable changes had occurred in the participating institutions, but that no way to measure the "ripple effect" had been established.

The 1974 Portland Convention closed by scheduling the next meeting in Miami and approving a host of resolutions. The content of these resolutions is significant and a cursory review of their content reveals that colleges were urged to take certain positions:[8]

1. . . . maintain little or no tuition in support of universal access to community colleges. . . .
2. State-wide salary schedules <u>not</u> be adopted in the various states.
3. The Federal Government refrain from imposing collective bargaining on the public sector of higher education.
4. The various states refrain from imposing collective bargaining laws. . . .
5. . . . states are encouraged to eliminate tenure to better insure accountability.
6. . . . funds be earmarked for postsecondary education in the form of instructional aid.
7. . . . all agencies regulating higher education to resist the efforts of four year colleges and universities in duplicating two-year A.A. Degree type or vocational/technical programs normally found in two-year public postsecondary institutions.

There is an obvious sophistication to these resolutions not found previously in the minutes of ACCT meetings. There is also, as evidenced by the position on tenure, the continued representation of feelings and views common to the business or commercial world.

The 1975 Miami Convention introduced ACCT to another reality of modern life in the United States. Considerable pressure was put on ACCT by representatives from minority groups. The issue was the lack of representation of ethnic groups on the ACCT Board and on convention planning and implementation committees. There was note made also of a lack of funds to get such representatives to ACCT meetings. The pressure from minorities proved difficult to deal with on a parliamentary basis at that meeting. It did have an effect on subsequent ACCT actions when the Board of Directors, in the following fallmeeting, passed the following:[9]

> The President is to appoint a special committee, composed of members of ethnic minorities within the Association and members of the Board of Directors to study the problems of minorities and make a report and recommendations to the Board of Directors at their spring meeting.

It was also suggested that a member of a minority group be appointed by the new President to serve on the Board of Directors.

Awards Authorized and Trust Fund Established

Also at Miami in 1975, two awards were authorized for annual presentation. The first would be called the "Dr. Marie Y. Martin Professional Leadership Award." This would be presented to a professional educator who had contributed outstanding professional service to the two-year postsecondary program. The second award would be to honor outstanding trustee service and would be called the "M. Dale Ensign Leadership Award." The "Martin Award" was presented to Dr. Martin, and the "Ensign Award" was presented to Jeanne Goddard.

The First Decade

Nineteen seventy-four through seventy-five brought to an end, roughly, the first decade of trustee efforts to organize a national association and their subsequent experiences with it. That period, 1965-1975, was frought with peril, but it had also been frought with opportunity. Fortunately, it was the latter that caught the attention of most.

Summary

Pioneering, dependence, independence, consolidation, transition, and success. These were all steps taken by the new ACCT on the way to achieving growing stability and maturity. All periods of development for ACCT had been critical, but none more so than the years between 1972-75 when independence was the challenge and rising to the responsibility of it was the task. Perhaps the best measure of the feeling of success was the confidence in the future of ACCT expressed by establishing, in 1974-75, an ACCT Trust Fund. Past presidents of the ACCT were to serve as directors. Thus, the past became a solid prologue for future activties.

Footnotes for Chapter Six:

1. Senate Meeting Minutes: Council of Community College Boards, National School Board Association. April 15, 1972. Mimeographed. From ACCT files, Washington, D.C. p. 2.

2. "History of the Association of Community College Trustees - 1974-75," from ACCT files, Washington, D.C. Undated. Mimeographed. Author not indicated.

3. ACCT Senate Minutes. October 6, 1972. Atlanta. Mimeographed. From ACCT files, Washington, D.C.

4. ACCT Senate Minutes. November 3, 1973. New Orleans. Mimeographed. From ACCT files, Washington, D.C.

5. ACCT Senate Minutes. September 24, 1974. Portland. Mimeographed. From ACCT files, Washington, D.C.

6. ACCTion Consortium - Highlights of 1975-76. Washington, D.C.: ACCTion Consortium. Undated. p. 2.

7. ACCTion Consortium - Highlights of 1975-76. Ibid. p. 3.

8. ACCT Senate Minutes. September 24, 1974. Portland. Ibid.

9. ACCT Senate Minutes. October 3, 1975. Miami Beach, Florida. Mimeographed. From ACCT files, Washington, D.C.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Growth and Maturity 1975-82

Between 1965 and 1975 there had been a steady progression through pioneering periods to settling in again for the long haul. Left behind through this process were the questions about the correctness of the move to independent status and if survival were an issue. Fortunately, left in the past was the problem of competition between different associations seeking to represent community college trustees. ACCT had gained ascendance as the national association for community college trustees.

The period from 1976 to 1982 was marked by an increasing number of community colleges and technical institutes joining the ACCT. It could be said that the ACCT represented over half of the trustees in the United States serving on the boards of these institutions. It could also be said that there were substantial numbers of eligible institutions still not represented by any association. The urge described here so often of trustees wanting to "go it alone" apparently translates into many not seeing advantages in extending beyond the local community scene. ACCT could ultimately become attractive to such institutions. It remains a challenge for ACCT to help these non-members when help is wanted--to maintain an open and attractive door.

For now, though, it can be reasonably concluded that ACCT has reached a self perpetuating maturity much more rapidly than could have been predicted either in 1965, 1968, or 1972--all key dates in the development of what has become ACCT in 1982.

What is ACCT?

It may now be fairly asked just what ACCT has become. One trustee, Walt Thompson of Ohlone College, California, has attempted to answer this:[1]

> The Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) is an organization created by, managed by, and supported strongly by community college trustees throughout the United States. It operates as a forum for trustees to learn together, exchange information, develop a national voice and better serve their individual institutions.
>
> Trustees have found that the opportunity to meet together results in a meaningful exchange of ideas. Participation in ACCT workshops, seminars, and organizational activities offer the lay trustee many basic tools of boardmanship that can be acquired in no other way.
>
> Membership in ACCT is of the institutional type. While the primary thrust is toward serving the basic needs of the trustee, ACCT serves the balance of the institution as well. A better

informed board greatly assists the college's chief administrator. . . .

At the present time, ACCT represents approximately 700 two-year institutions of higher education within the United States and Canada.

Mission Statement

The objectives of the Association are clearly spelled out in a set of Bylaws adopted in October, 1980, at the ACCT Convention in Honolulu. These Bylaws speak to the need to promote the philosophy of the community college movement--to extend educational opportunity. There is a mission statement in them.

These Bylaws focus trustee effort on the demands of public accountability and the reality of faculty associations and union pressures. But, at the same time, they offer a much wider view of responsibility than that which is limited to a single campus or college. It is clearly stated that the missions of ACCT extend to other associational relations on both a national and international basis. However, the home base is not forgotten as trustees, and the Association, are charged to, ". . .work for adequate and equitable financial support of postsecondary education," and to, ". . .promote public understanding of the role of the community college and technical institute."[2]

These Bylaws speak, in short, to the need for commitment--commitment of citizen-educators to the welfare of the institutions they serve; commitment to the welfare of the citizens served by those institutions.

Organization

The bylaws also describe the organization and governance of the ACCT and define voting membership--which is institutional, i.e., institutions are credentialed and then designated representative to vote for them.

Fees: Fees are on a graduated scale. The larger the institution, as measured by student body size, the larger the fees. These larger institutions have the privileges of naming additional voting representatives, as many as three, depending on their size and the fees they pay.

Senate: A Senate is the principal policy making body. It is composed of the voting members. It is advised by a Board of Directors--and the president and secretary/treasurer of the Board serve also as president and secretary/treasurer of the Senate.

Board of Directors: The Board is charged to meet at least twice a year with one of these meetings held at the time of the annual fall convention. Board members are elected from the Senate, and then in turn elect their own officers. The

officers include a first and second vice president in addition to the president and secretary/treasurer.

Executive Committee: The Board, in turn, has an Executive Committee. This committee is composed of the officers, and the immediate past president and the Executive Director of the ACCT staff are ex-officio members. The Executive Committee acts on behalf of the Board when it is not in session, and is responsible for, ". . .administering the property, funds and business affairs of the Association."[3] They are charged to meet no less than twice per year to consider the business affairs and well-being of the Association and to submit a report on these meetings to the next meeting of the full Board.

Augmenting the formal structure called for in the Bylaws are a variety of standing committees and advisory groups. Allowance is made also for non-voting memberships--associate, lifetime, and honorary--to be held by individuals.

Bylaws are not, of course, the whole story, though they are an important part. They state the philosophy and the goals and they identify the general mechanisms that are established to attempt to achieve the philosophy and goals. They attend also to legal considerations. The Bylaws are, perhaps most importantly, a very public statement of intent, but it is only a statement. ACCT, as with any association, in the final analysis, is only what it does.

The Purpose of ACCT

To pick up on the statement of Thompson's quoted earlier, and yet to repeat the theme of ACCT which has appeared time and time again, a main thrust of ACCT has always been to educate trustees to the role they should play in the governance of community colleges and technical institutes. This thrust must be viewed against the reality of board member turnover.

Though it is unlikely as many new board members will appear as the result of new colleges being founded, as was the case between 1955 and 1970, new members will appear simply as they replace those moving on. Therefore, it is quite likely that this main thrust--to help educate trustees by involving them in educating other trustees--will remain germane at least through the immediate future. The likelihood of this is enhanced also by the fact that not only will new trustees appear, but so will new issues and challenges to face them.

At the 1976 Convention in St. Louis, ACCT President George Potter of Michigan listed three principal goals for his administration:[4]

(1) Continued improvement of the Convention and Regional seminars,
(2) Improvement in both the quality and regularity of ACCT publications, and

(3) Continued membership growth and retention.

Committees and Advisory Groups

There are now six standing committees: 1) Bylaws; 2) Convention and Resolutions; 3) Federal Relations; 4) Future Directions; 5) Liaison with AACJC: and 6) Membership. Additionally, there is a Past Presidents Council charged with management of the ACCT Foundation Trust Fund. There are also advisory groups.

The Minority Affairs Assembly: A principle advisory group to the ACCT Board and Executive Committee is the Minority Affairs Assembly. This Assembly was created in 1977 at the ACCT Convention held in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. It is organized in a parallel form to the parent ACCT with a national and five regional bodies. Both the national and each regional body is served by a chair person.

The Assembly was brought into being in response to requests coming from various groups. These requests surfaced in force at earlier national conventions and, in particular, at Miami in 1975 and in St. Louis in 1976. The results of this effort found formal fruition in 1977, and since 1977 the interests of women have been incorporated within the purposes of the Assembly.

The purposes of the Assembly generally are to encourage minorities and women to find roles within the ACCT and to encourage support for these activities. The need for support to make participation possible is viewed as critical--it must first be possible to attend ACCT functions! There has been marked increase in participation of minorities and women in all ACCT committees as a direct result of the organization and operations of the Minority Affairs Assembly.

A letter from Doris Ward of May 2, 1978, set forth the principal desired and planned activities for the Assembly as including:[5]

1. Sponsoring a workshop at the (coming) national conference - "Changing Role of Community Colleges Concerning Minorities," and at all subsequent conventions.
2. Scheduling a workshop, "The Orientation and Education of New Minority Trustees" at all the national conferences.
3. Encouraging trustees to submit articles to the Advisor and the Quarterly on a regular basis.
4. Identifying with the help of the ACCT National Office, all ethnic minority trustees.
5. Holding an organizational meeting of the Assembly in Seattle at the Pacific Regional Seminar on July 22 from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and July 23 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Purpose of this meeting will be:
   5.1 Tentative adoption or approval of Constitution and Bylaws developed by Bob Garrison and Joe Cleveland.
   5.2 Establish additonal program objectives for next year

at the national meeting. Program objectives set thus far include:

5.2.1 Increase minority trustees on appointed board.
5.2.2 Orientation and education of new minority trustees.
5.2.3 Pre-packaged community college for developing African nations.
5.2.4 Development of regional programs.
5.2.5 Development of a Scheduled Program for Advisor.
5.2.6 Establish a communications network.
5.2.7 Development of minority policy issues.
5.2.8 Development of minority policy issues dissemination system to ACCT and individual institutions.

The Advisory Committee of Presidents: A second important advisory group is the Advisory Committee of Presidents. This is a new and important linkage with the institutions which support the ACCT effort. It is also another important, though indirect, avenue for sharing concerns with the AACJC.

Perhaps more importantly though, this Advisory Committee of Presidents has served to express concerns to ACCT of individual college presidents who have not always been totally at ease with the notion that their trustees might be moving in different directions than themselves. A bit of paranoia here is understandable and also basically healthy. The hard fact is that trustees do not depend on that designation for a living, and most presidents do depend on their continued election to that office for a living.

In an important letter from Meardy of ACCT to John Casey, Seattle Community College District and Chair of the Advisory Committee of Presidents in 1981, several questions were posed, such as: 1) How is ACCT perceived in the eyes of college presidents? of trustees? Essentially, this correspondence revealed some problem areas but reflected the general acceptance of and strong support of the ACCT by the presidents of institutions comprising the membership of this Association.

As in 1973 (after the fury of activities of 1972), 1976-77 was to be a time of settling in again--to consolidate gains and improve the quality of the operation. This kind of self examination is a point of maturity all of its own. By creating and listening to the Advisory Committee of Presidents, ACCT demonstrated strength.

Publications: The March, 1977, Advisor reflected this mood of ACCT with the lead article, "Banner Year for ACCT - ACCT Reaching Maturity - A Rewarding Past - A Bright Future."[5] The article noted an increase in membership but concentrated

on the increase in services to them--particularly in the publications arena.

In addition to ten reports, monographs and speeches published from July, 1976, to March, 1977, ACCT continued the newsletter, Advisor, and the ACCT-O-Line (a subscription publication). The new Trustee Quarterly (as a four-issue per year journal-type publication) was added. And attention was called to other publications of interest to trustees.

ACCJC Served by ACCT in Federal Relations: A significant development organizationally for ACCT in 1977 had been to hire a Director of Federal Relations. Michael Edwards was selected and assigned to national headquarters.

The importance of this was that it made it possible to turn around a "confederation" agreement reached with AACJC in September and October of 1972--then ACCT was dependent on AACJC for federal liaison services. Now, acting through the continuing AACT/AACJC Joint Liaison Committee, AACJC contracted for legislative services from the ACCT!

This Joint Commission of ACCT and AACJC has 14 members--seven from each of the associations. A chair is appointed each year and is rotated--one year from ACCT and the next from AACJC.

Meeting in Canada: By the fall of 1977, the largest ACCT Annual Convention, the eighth, had gone international. The site selected and used was Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. Response, as measured by registrants and participants, was higher than expected. Attendance set an all-time reocord of 1,357!

An important regional meeting was also held north of the border. J. Sundstrom reviewed in 1982 at New Orleans, a report entitled, Northeast Region Seminar, Analysis of the Past Five Years. It was reported that the regional seminar held in Toronto, Ontario, had: (1) the largest total paid registration and attendance, (2) the greatest total income of any Northeast Region Seminar held by ACCT, and (3) the second highest net income.

Additionally, this Toronto Seminar was the first regional ACCT meeting to be held in Canada. It was jointly developed and coordinated by Canadian and U.S. trustees. All reported they benefitted from the joint planning and in sharing experiences and ideas. It was evident there are a number of common problems and concerns facing both U.S. and Canadian community college trustees, and there were similarities in the ideas to and approaches of how to deal with issues.

Proposition #13: A Watershed for ACCT

The passage of Proposition 13 in California and the subsequent wave of tax restriction legislation across the United States can be viewed as a watershed for

ACCT. Prior to this action, ACCT had enjoyed a steady record of membership growth, expansion and new services. Suddenly, the whole structure was threatened by the kinds of reductions of budget that each ACCT member institution might have to put into effect. At issue, of course, was the ACCT membership fee paid by institutions.

Fees were and are the foundation for the total ACCT budget. ACCT engages in other income producing activities including a profitable convention. But fees are basic.

Table 8

Proposed Revisions 1980-81 Budget

Revenue Accounts	FY 77	FY 78	FY 79	FY 80	FY 81	Income (Projected)
1. MEMBERSHIP DUES:						
Old Regular Members	320	340	372	404	433	$235,480
Old Assoc. Members	30	30	35	36	36	3,600
New Regular Members	26	38	42	36	20	3,000
New Assoc. Members	3	9	2	4	3	150
Lost Regular Members	6	6	10	7	10	(5,450)
Lost Assoc. Members	3	4	2	3	3	(300)
						$236,480
Original Budget:	456 Regular		Revised Budget:		443 Regular 36 Associate	
2. ANNUAL CONVENTION:						
Paid Registrants	649	940	844	732	750	$ 52,850
Meals:						31.900
Total Expected Convention Revenue						$ 84,750
3. SEMINARS:						
Pacific Region	113	146	150	81	125	$ 11,875
*Southern Region	71	60	143	84	100	(9,500)
*Central Region	57	107	117	87	100	(9,500)
Western Region					125	11,875
Northeast Region		42	65	50	45	(3,500)
National Legislative		153	145	208	200	24,125
Total Expected Seminar Revenue						$(70,375)

Table 8 indicates that ACCT survived this Proposition 13 crisis quite well. Under Item #1, Table 8, for example, it can be seen that new members attracted from 1977 to 1980 far exceeded lost members, and the number of institutions served continued to grow.

The annual convention experienced some retrenchment during this time. From the high of 1,357 registrants at the Annual Convention in 1977 in Vancouver, attendance dwindled to 940 in 1978 in Washington, D.C., 844 in 1979 in Detroit, and to 732 in 1980 in Honolulu. The sites of these last two conventions probably was a major factor in the reduction of registrants. It should also be remembered that an immediate impact of Proposition 13 thinking on college budgets was to eliminate or reduce college travel funds. What seems to be a fair conclusion relative to ACCT is that membership is maintained as a first college priority and travel to conventions is regarded as second or expendable.

As this goes to press, the 1982 convention held (again) in New Orleasn drew the second highest attendance in history. This was so in spite of a situation where the United States was experiencing its worst recession since the 1930s.

Table 8 is also informative regarding the principal activities of ACCT at the present. These are: 1) service to a general membership in terms of representation and advocacy in the national capitol; 2) regional seminars which treat topics of interest to member institutions; and 3) the annual convention. A major activity, additionally, is in the area of publications.

Table 8 does not adequately present the present membership in ACCT. The reason for this is that some of the regular members have multi-campus operations. Table 9 explains membership in more detail:

Table 9

Association of Community College Trustees
Membership Report
As of January 31, 1981

	Int'l	U.S.	Pacific	Western	Central	Northeast	Southern
DISTRICTS	12	431	95	52	113	47	124
COLLEGES	12	626	158	58	181	59	170
ASSOCIATE	2	35	8	4	9	8	6
LIFETIME		10	2		4	1	3
MEMBERS (DISTRICT ASSOCIATE LIFETIME)	14	476	105	56	126	56	133

The key figure in Table 9 is the number of colleges, 626, represented by ACCT. This has since increased to over 700.

Though Proposition 13 seemed at first a dire threat to any association depending on educational institutional membership fees, it is obvious that ACCT has not only survived but continued to prosper. This is thought to be at least partially a

result of a continuing policy of assessing current problems in a futuristic frame. As example of this is seen in the report filed by Verne R. Moseman, Chairman of the ACCT Future Directions Committee in 1978:[7]

REPORT OF FUTURE DIRECTIONS COMMITTEE
Scottsdale, Arizona - June 3, 1978

The committee has met twice since our last board meeting in Vancouver, B.C. Most of the first portion of this report will deal with our discussions in Washington, D.C. on February 5, 1978. Additional discussions held in Scottsdale on June 2, 1978, will then be reported.

I. WASHINGTON MEETING

A. The committee convened in Washington, D.C. on February 5, 1978, with all members present (Mrs. Goud, Mrs. Powell, Mr. Reid, Mr. Jensen, and the Chairman, Mr. Moseman). Since the 1976-77 committee had made a very comprehensive and potentially far-reaching report to the board, following receipt of input from many board members and others, our first business was to review the previous report as to its implementation to date and classify as to "adopted," "dropped," or "repeat recommendation." The following numbered paragraphs from last year's report and our recommendations are as follows:

1. Continue policy of ACCT membership being that of a trustee organization.

2. Continue to strive for cooperation with AACJC with complementary national image.

3. Continue to strive for ACCT budget sufficient to fund committee expenses, within reason, and continue to seek grants from private foundations. Further, new recommendations that a professional staff members be assigned this responsibility in addition to other duties, that perhaps there are some "slack periods" during which this endeavor could become a primary emphasis.

4. President-elect proposal dropped.

5. Regionalization discussed later in this report.

6. Continue evaluating the effectiveness of publications; "Advisor," "ACCT-O-Line" and all other publications should be monitored as to trustee useage and interest. We should not hesitate to drop any publication that has outlived its usefulness.

7. The Executive Director continue an annual report including recommended goals for ACCT and a staff evaluation primarily for the purpose of assuring best possible utilization of staff talents.

8. Re-emphasize importance of quality ACCT Board performance, including informing prospective board members of duties and probable time commitments before they are elected. An additional recommendation that new ACCT board members have a better orientation opportunity prior to undertaking board decision making. A suggestion might be to hold a board retreat between convention time and the Spring meeting, either similar to the Pheasant Run

meeting of a few years ago or, perhaps, limiting it to new members and the Executive Committee.

9. Legislative thrust should continue to:
   a. Oppose totally a federal collective bargaining law.
   b. Promote local control of community colleges, even at possible sacrifice of some federal education proposals, and be willing to oppose federal programs that further erode the value of the dollar by providing services that can be provided locally. On the other hand, where programs exist or are established, we must see that community colleges receive a fair share of available financial resources.
   c. Federal Relations staff to be aware of and, indeed, cultivate the people in HEW who write the regulations that implement congressional legislation.

B. The committee reviewed the "Issues and Answers" results from the Vancouver convention and took no action other than to encourage the Convention Planning Committee to consider carefully. Trustees are coming under increasing surveillance from the electorate due to "sunshine" and open meetings laws, coupled with a really serious "taxpayer revolt" in many states. Our convention and seminars must be evaluated regularly to assure programs of real pragmatic value at a cost within the reach of most of our members.

The Late 70's

A review and analysis of the 1978, 1979 and 1980 Annual Convention programs indicated that trustees continue to have an across-the-board interest in trustees concerns plus those of the institutions they serve. This was determined by an analysis of the titles of the workshops and special interest group meetings offered.

Interest was heaviest in the area of trusteeship activities and orientation, fiscal concerns and affirmative action and minority issues. There was, however, substantial interest in educational programming.

Not understood, but of substantive interest, was the almost total lack of workshops on student development. There were discussion sessions on student publications and other student "problem" areas, but there was little concern specifically related to student progress.

Also of interest was the low profile that collective bargaining and arbitration now has. It is suggested that community colleges and the board serving them are more sophisticated in these general areas and, hence, less concerned about them. It might also be a result of the annual offering at the ACCT Convention of a "Collective Bargaining Academy" which runs through a whole day of the Convention.

Into the 80s

A New Home: The big news in 1980 for ACCT was moving from L'Enfant in Wash-

ington, D.C. to a condominium purchased in Annandale, Virginia. This investment in property and related capitalization was made possible by the establishment of a building fund to which member institutions were invited to contribute. The move to Annandale was completed by June 21, 1980.

Presidential Search and Screen Service: Additionally in 1980, two highly innovative activities were added to the services ACCT offered members. Both services deal in the area of assisting boards relative to the position of president of the college. The first service is for ACCT to handle, for fee, a presidential search and screen process. Several contracts to do this have been received. The second service is to place an interim president in a position where the presidency has been vacated.

The basic concept behind both these services is simply that one of the most important responsibilities of a governing board is usually thought of as the selection of a chief executive of the institution served. Also, as ACCT is a trustee and board service-oriented organization, it should help trustees in this important matter where help is wanted and needed.

A sharp distinction is made between an interim president and an acting president. The interim president is placed for a short and stated period of time--three months to a year, perhaps, and the interim president agrees ahead of time not to aspire to the presidency. The thought is that former presidents now retired, and with a strong track record of success in that office, could be recommended by ACCT to help out institutions in need of a temporary chief executive.

It is not unusual for an "acting" president to apply for the presidency, and when passed over in the final selection a "situation" develops. This "situation" is simply that the new president must pick up the reins from somebody who does not necessarily want to give them up. An interim president avoids this possible complication in an orderly transfer of leadership. An interim presidency eliminates this possibility.

New Approaches for Membership Recruitment: At the 1982 Convention in New Orleans, C. Young reported membership recruiting approaches had taken several new and experimental directions in the past year:[8]

> Membership recruiting approaches taken during the past year were in several directions and resulted in increasing members and interest in the ACCT. The success of this program is due to the outstanding cooperation at every level of the organization; Sally Hutchins, in particular, was commended for her untiring efforts in implementing suggestions and coordinating all membership activities.
>
> During the past year the Membership Committee focused on:
>
> Recruiting colleges with larger campuses.
>
> Special program for former members to reaffiliate with ACCT for the final three months.

Special emphasis on encouraging non-members to join by inviting them to attend Regional Seminars and Conventions.

Lifetime memberships.

Because the experimental program for encouraging former members to become reaffiliated with ACCT was successful, this strategy should be continued next year. In addition, the Lifetime Membership Program, begun this year, should be continued and expanded. One other recommendation was that the new Executive Committee clarify the idea of Associate Memberships for business and industry, as this is still a gray area.

1982 Convention - Other Concerns

Also considered at New Orleans were:

(1) to explore a deepening relationship with industry and to encourage their support of and grants to ACCT;

(2) to authorize the Central Staff of ACCT to computerize operations;

(3) to encourage members to report to L. Carson, Chairman, ACCT International Relations Committee and trustee, San Bernardino Community College District, any involvement in international relations programs; and

(4) to conduct required election, business and organizational meetings.

Endorsement of This Book

One of the final actions taken by the Board of Directors in New Orleans was the formal endorsement of this publication. Meardy recommended this action be taken. The Board also, very generously as it had not been asked to do so, passed a motion that this book be included in the ACCT approved list of publications.[9]

Trustees and Their National Association - The Future

There have been a number of predictions made regarding trustees over the years. Most of these have stated what it was that trustees might have to come to do or be like in the future. One of the more interesting sets of suggestions was presented at a 1970 trustee workshop held at U.C.L.A. in conjunction with a national conference devoted to trustee concerns. Eleanore Nettle, a trustee in attendance at the workshop from College of San Mateo in California, first summed up the early 1960's as having been "comfortable" and blessed with public confidence, successful bond elections and tranquility. She suggested the late 1960's "nervousness" de-

rived from student unrest, faculty militancy and a taxpayers strike. She then went on to suggest what would characterize trustee behavior in the 1970's:[10]

1. Boards and chief administrators will jointly plan programs and resolve problems.
2. Chief administrators will not be expected to know all the answers or to have perfect judgment.
3. Questions and suggestions from trustees will not be considered as meddling in "administration."
4. Boards will set and review institutional goals and objectives.
5. Boards will establish educational program priorities.
6. Boards will evaluate college performance.

Trustees are encouraged to see if they have, indeed, come that far in ten years since those challenges were posed.

What was not predicted in 1970 was that a nationally based trustee organization would come into existence and be prepared to assist so strongly in helping boards out of the "nervousness" of the late 1960's and early 1970's. It should be remembered that in 1970 there were basically three competing associations seeking to house community college trustees in some fashion. In the ten years since, a single body--a wholly new one--emerged as a focal point for trustees to rally around in their continued effort to be better trustees. In the intervening decade since the ACCT was founded, it can be reported with accuracy that the Association moved relatively quickly from birth pangs to an obvious maturity.

The dreams of those in 1965 that some association could and should serve trustees on a national basis took vast amounts of energy, commitment and risk to put into reality. Trustees, themselves, took matters into their own hands and formed their own association. Further, this Association was dedicated to the improvement of themselves as functioning trustees, and, in the process, improved the quality of services of the colleges they served to both the communities in which they were situated and the individual students which came to them.

Political involvement, organizational concerns, and trustee development through expanded services and publications remain a set of prime goals for both trustees and their ACCT. As mentioned in the Preface, the trustees are citizen educators who have been converted to the philosophy of the institutions they serve. The pleasant thing about this is that the philosophy is such a positive one. Simply put, it is that the country deserves to have quality education extended to people previously denied such an opportunity. The goal is to broaden access to postsecondary education and increase opportunity for individuals to profit from it.

Summary

A look at the nature and growth of community colleges and of the numbers and

trustees who serve them has been presented. This was by way of introducing the main topic which was an attempt to trace the line of development of the Association of Community College Trustees.

The period concentrated upon was 1965 to 1982. The analysis of it allows a few general statements:

1. ACCT has moved steadily from the pioneering efforts of a dedicated few to a polished, mature Association.
2. The dream of establishing a nationally based Association for these trustees has been realized.
3. It can also be concluded fairly that there is much work yet to be done.
4. A prediction is made easily--it will continue to be a joy to see new trustees come on to community college boards, gain associational strength through ACCT and rise to the challenges rising from a perpetually changing society.

The service in the end is to assist individuals to find places of respect in our society. Community colleges and their trustees are dedicated in service to assist in the shaping of productive, dignified and self-respecting citizens. On the whole, it can be said this is a very worthwhile thing to try to do.

Footnotes to Chapter Seven:

1. Thompson, W.: "What is ACCT?" Mimeographed, Undated. From ACCT files. Washington, D.C.

2. Bylaws - Association of Community College Trustees. Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees. October 8, 1980, p. 1.

3. Bylaws. Ibid. p. 10.

4. Advisor. Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees. Vol. 3, No. 3, March, 1977.

5. Letter from Doris Ward to the ACCT Executive Committee, May 2, 1978.

6. Minutes, Board of Directors Meeting. New Orleans, October 12, 1982.

7. Moseman, V. R.: Report of Future Directions Committee." Washington, D.C. ACCT Files. June 3, 1978.

8. Young, C.: "Report of Membership Committee," Minutes, Board of Directors Meeting. Ibid.

9. Action Item E from Board of Directors Agenda. Meeting in New Orleans of October 16, 1982.

10. Hatfield, T.: "Expanding Perceptions of Junior College Board Members: A Report of a Workshop," The Junior College Board of Trustees, Occasional Report No. 16. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, University of California. February, 1971. p. 58.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Publications of the Association of Community College Trustees:

1. Personal notes regarding the early history of the Association from Worth Keene, Jeanne Goddard, and Walter Thompson. All mimeographed and undated. All in the files at ACCT in Washington, D.C.

2. Newsletters of the Council of Community College Boards and of the Association of Community College Trustees. Dating from 1970 to 1982. All in the files at ACCT in Washington, D.C.

3. Minutes of the Senate Meetings of both the CCCB and the ACCT from 1970 to 1982. Mimeographed. All in the files at ACCT in Washington, D.C.

4. ACCT Trustee Quarterly. Winter Issue, 1976-77. Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees.

5. Bylaws. Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees. October, 1980.

B. Monographs:

1. Drake, S.: Research Report: A Study of Community and Junior College Boards of Trustees. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1977. 59 pages.

2. Grafe, G.: The Trustees Profile of 1976. Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees. Undated. 14 pages.

3. Johnson, B. Lamar (editor): The Junior College Board of Trustees. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, University of California. February 1971. 65 pages.

4. MacLaren, S.: Community College - University Relations: An Examination of the Positive Functions of Conflict. Stillwater, Oklahoma and Washington, D.C.: Oklahoma State University and the Council of Universities and Colleges of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1978. 11 pages.

5. Meek, D. and Morgan, D.: Council of Universities and Colleges: An Introductory History. Tucson: Higher Education Program, University of Arizona. March 1977. 53 pages.

6. Wilson, R. and Harper, W. (editors): Trustee Papers - 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1973. 67 pages.

7. Pray, F.: A New Look at Community College Boards of Trustees and Presidents and Their Relationships: Suggestions for Change. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1976.

APPENDIX A

Chain of Leadership and of Key Events for ACCT
1965-1982

1965: Chicago. Three person committee of trustees convoked by Freeman Vaughan of NSBA: Jeanne Goddard (Florida); Roy Jones (Illinois) and J. Stuart Doyle (Illinois).

1966: Minneapolis/NSBA Convention. April. Goddard asked by NSBA to lead trustee focused sessions.

1967: Portland/NSBA Convention. April. Goddard elected by trustees present to serve as chair in requesting NSBA organize a Council of Community College Boards (CCCB) within NSBA.

Chicago: August. Goddard, as chair, with Paul Wolfe (Iowa), Warren Smith (Wyoming), Ruth Shepherd (Washington), James Bland (Maryland) and Worth Keene (California) met with NSBA officials and were designated an Interim Steering Committee for the formation of CCCB.

1968: Detroit/NSBA Convention. April. Dismal showing of those interested in CCCB. NSBA offered virtually no staff help.

Evanston, Illinois: May. J. Stuart Doyle hired by NSBA as secretary for the planned CCCB. Goddard continued as chair, Interim Committee.

Chicago: September. Doyle, NSBA planned workshops. Most successful.

1969: Miami/NSBA Convention: April. Thirty-three boards represented from seventeen states, adopt CCCB Bylaws and Constitution. CCCB formally recognized by NSBA. Elected as officers:
Jeanne Goddard (Florida), Chair
Worth Keene (California), First Vice-Chair
Paul Wolfe (Iowa), Second Vice-Chair

Washington, D.C.: March. Goddard asked by AACJC to help plan a program for trustees for the April 1969 AACJC Annual Convention in Atlanta.

Evanston: June. J. Stuart Doyle resigned.

Chicago: September. Second O'Hare workshops cancelled.

1970: San Francisco/NSBA Convention: April. Elected as CCCB officers:
Worth Keene (California), Chair
Dale Ensign (Wyoming), First Vice-Chair
Frank Gallagher (Michigan), Second Vice-Chair

Evanston: June. William Meardy hired by NSBA as secretary to the CCCB. Meardy to begin July 1, 1970.

Chicago: September. National workshops in Chicago revived by Meardy with great success. Some refer to this as the first National Convention for CCCB.

1971: Philadelphia/NSBA Convention. Elected as CCCB officers;
Dale Ensign (Wyoming), Chair
Frank Gallagher (Michigan), First Vice-Chair
George Fellows (Georgia), Second Vice-Chair

Denver: September. National workshops of CCCB continued. This may be regarded as the second National Convention of CCCB.

1972: March. An emergency meeting of the CCCB Board to consider dissolution from NSBA. Dissolution endorsed for recommendation to Senate.

San Francisco/NSBA Convention: April. CCCB Senate voted to dissolve the relationship with NSBA. ACCT launched.

Atlanta/ACCT Convention: September. First ACCT Convention. Third National Convention of Community College Trustees. ACCT officers elected:
Frank Gallagher (Michigan), President
B. A. "Bud" Jensen (Iowa), First Vice-President
George Fellows (Georgia), Second Vice-President
Malcolm P. Pennypacker (New Jersey), Secretary-Treasurer

William Meardy moved from Secretary to CCCB under NSBA to the Executive Director of ACCT.

Merge with AACJC Council of Trustees effected when AACJC Council absorbed by the new ACCT. Formally in effect November 15, 1972.

Confederation of ACCT with AACJC established with focus on Federal relations and Legislative concerns. ACCT contracts to buy services from AACJC.

1973: New Orleans/ACCT Fourth Annual Convention. Officers elected:
B. A. "Bud" Jensen (Iowa), President
George Fellows (Georgia), First Vice-President
Malcolm P. Pennypacker (New Jersey), Second Vice-President
William G. Dannels (Pennsylvania), Secretary-Treasurer

1974: Portland/ACCT Fifth Annual Convention. Officers elected:
George Fellows (Georgia), President
Malcolm Pennypacker (New Jersey), First Vice-President
George Potter (Michigan), Second Vice-President
Frank Hancock (Florida), Secretary-Treasurer

1975: Miami/ACCT Sixth Annual Convention. Officers elected:
Malcolm P. Pennypacker (New Jersey), President
George Potter (Michigan), First Vice-President
Frank Hancock (Florida), Second Vice-President
George Rodda (California), Secretary-Treasurer

1976: St. Louis/ACCT Seventh Annual Convention. Officers elected:
George Potter (Michigan), President
Frank Hancock (Florida), First Vice-President
Dick Klassen (Kansas), Second Vice-President
James B. Tatum (Missouri), Secretary-Treasurer

1977: Vancouver, British Columbia/ACCT Eighth Annual Convention. Officers elected:
Frank Hancock (Florida), President
Dick Klassen (Kansas), First Vice-President
James B. Tatum (Missouri), Second Vice-President
C. Reid (California), Secretary-Treasurer

ACCT Board authorized sale of legislative services to AACJC.

1978: Washington, D.C./ACCT Ninth Annual Convention. Officers elected:
Dick Klassen (Kansas), President
James B. Tatum (Missouri), First Vice-President
Charles Reid (California), Second Vice-President
L. Sicula, Secretary-Treasurer

1979: Detroit/ACCT Tenth Annual Convention. Officers elected:
James Tatum (Missouri), President
Charles Reid (California), First Vice-President
R. Mears, Second Vice-President
L. Sicula, Secretary-Treasurer

1980: Honolulu/ACCT Eleventh Annual Convention. Officers elected:
Charles Reid (California), President
R. Mears, First Vice-President
R. J. Legg (Texas), Second Vice-President
L. Sicula, Secretary-Treasurer

1981: Boston/ACCT Annual Convention. Officers elected:
Ronald D. Mears (Kansas), President
Reagan H. Legg (Texas), First Vice-President
Sheila M. Korhammer (Pennsylvania), Second Vice-President
Wayne Newton (Iowa), Secretary-Treasurer

1982: New Orleans/ACCT Thirteenth Annual Convention. Officers elected:
Reagan H. Legg (Texas), President
Sheila M. Korhammer (Pennsylvania), First Vice-President
Wayne Newton (Iowa), Second Vice-President
Robert E. Garrison (Michigan), Secretary-Treasurer

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges
APR 10 1987